

SENATE.

THURSDAY, July 6, 1911.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the further reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah asks unanimous consent that the further reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

Mr. BORAH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to dispensing with the reading of the Journal? No objection is heard. The Journal, without objection, stands approved. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|-------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| Bacon | Cullom | McCumber | Shively |
| Borah | Cummins | Martin, Va. | Smith, S. C. |
| Brandeggee | Curtis | Martine, N. J. | Smoot |
| Briggs | du Pont | Nelson | Stone |
| Bristow | Guggenheim | Overman | Sutherland |
| Brown | Heyburn | Owen | Swanson |
| Bryan | Hitchcock | Page | Warren |
| Burnham | Johnson, Me. | Penrose | Watson |
| Burton | Johnston, Ala. | Perkins | Williams |
| Chamberlain | Jones | Poindexter | Works |
| Clapp | La Follette | Pomerene | |
| Culberson | Lippitt | Root | |

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FOSTER] is necessarily absent from the Chamber this morning on important business before the departments.

Mr. BURNHAM. The senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SHIVELY. Mr. colleague [Mr. KERN] is necessarily absent from the city on important business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-six Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum of the Senate is present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented resolutions adopted by the Central Conference of American Rabbis, at St. Paul, Minn., favoring the abrogation of the treaty between the United States and Russia, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of Local Chapter, American Woman's League, of Iola, Kans., remonstrating against the action of the Post Office Department in authorizing the distribution at public expense of copies of Senators' speeches attacking the American Woman's League, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. BRISTOW presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Kansas, remonstrating against the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WORKS presented memorials of sundry citizens of Eureka, Cal., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Johnston Sunday rest bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BURNHAM presented a memorial of Local Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Bow, N. H., and a memorial of Loudon Center Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Pittsfield, N. H., remonstrating against the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PERKINS presented a memorial of the board of directors of the Merchants' Exchange of San Francisco, Cal., relative to the fixing at an early date of tolls to be charged for passage through the Panama Canal, which was referred to the Committee on Intercoastal Canals.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a memorial of the Ancient Order of Hibernians of Southington, Conn., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. RAYNER presented a memorial of Elizabeth Grange, No. 135, Patrons of Husbandry, of Cortner, Md., and a memorial of Local Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Medford, Md., remonstrating against the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BOURNE presented a memorial of Cedar Grove Grange, No. 320, Patrons of Husbandry, of Columbia County, Oreg., remonstrating against the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WARREN. I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12109) to supply a deficiency in the appropriations for contingent expenses of the House of Representatives for the fiscal year 1911, and for other purposes, to report it with amendments, and I submit a report (No. 93) thereon. I give notice that I shall call up the bill for consideration later in the day or to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. LODGE on May 11, 1911, proposing to appropriate \$46,491.95 in settlement of the accounts of Paymaster John W. Morse, United States Navy, etc., intended to be proposed to the general deficiency appropriation bill, asked that the committee be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Claims, which was agreed to.

Mr. SHIVELY, from the Committee on the Census, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2983) for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Thirteenth Census, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 94) thereon.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask unanimous consent to file the views of the minority on the apportionment bill reported from the Committee on the Census. I am prepared to file the views at this time, but some members of the committee whom I hope to have join in the report are absent from the city, and therefore I ask leave to file that report later.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin asks permission to file at a later date the views of the minority upon the apportionment bill. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

Mr. DU PONT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2518) to provide for raising the volunteer forces of the United States in time of actual or threatened war, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 95) thereon.

REPORT OF MONETARY COMMISSION.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I think it is proper in this order of business to make an inquiry of the chairman of the Finance Committee. In the early days of the session I introduced a bill (S. 854) requiring the Monetary Commission to make a final report on or before the first day of the next session of Congress, and also providing for the discharge or dissolution of the commission the day after the meeting of Congress.

I think it is universally felt throughout the country that a commission which was organized more than three years ago for the purpose of presenting a measure to avert financial panics in the future should make a report, so that we may be provided with the material which will enable us to act speedily at the next session of Congress upon this very important subject.

I ask the chairman of the Finance Committee when, in his opinion, we may expect a report upon the bill I so introduced.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, there is no disposition on the part of the Finance Committee not to give consideration to the bill introduced by the Senator from Iowa. It would only seem natural to confer with the chairman of the Monetary Commission. There is indirect information that he will be prepared to report in any event next December. My information has been that he is expected almost any day in Washington. I will make a further effort to communicate with Mr. Aldrich, and I assure the Senator from Iowa that I will call a meeting of the committee next week and then take the matter up for consideration. There is no disposition whatever to delay it.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am very glad to have this assurance from the chairman, because there is no reason for delay. It is a very plain matter, and it is highly necessary not only that we act upon the subject at the next session, but it is equally necessary that we relieve the Treasury of the United States from the burden of this commission.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WORKS:

A bill (S. 2949) to establish a hydrographic station at Los Angeles, Cal.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 2950) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Hubbs (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURNHAM:

A bill (S. 2951) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Pinkham; and

A bill (S. 2952) granting an increase of pension to John H. Doeg; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 2953) to grant an honorable discharge to George P. Chandler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2954) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Belcher; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAYNER:

A bill (S. 2955) granting an increase of pension to Barbara E. Brown (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

NEW STATES AND CONSTITUTIONS.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have an address delivered before the law school of Yale University on Monday, June 19, 1911, by Hon. George W. Wickersham, Attorney General of the United States, on the subject of new States and constitutions. I move that the address be printed as a Senate document. (S. Doc. No. 62.)

The motion was agreed to.

ELECTION OF SENATORS BY DIRECT VOTE.

Mr. BORAH. I ask for a print of House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 39) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States as passed by the Senate showing the Senate amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the order for a print of House joint resolution 39 as passed by the Senate is entered.

AFFAIRS IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Mr. HEYBURN. I call attention to Order of Business 67, Senate bill 2761, reported from the Committee on the Philippines with amendments, Report No. 83. I ask that it be referred back to the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho asks unanimous consent that the following bill be recommitted to the Committee on the Philippines.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 2761) to amend an act approved February 6, 1905, entitled "An act to amend an act approved July 1, 1902, entitled 'An act temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes,' and to amend an act approved March 8, 1902, entitled 'An act temporarily to provide revenue for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes,' and to amend an act approved March 2, 1903, entitled 'An act to establish a standard of value and to provide for a coinage system in the Philippine Islands,' and to provide for the more efficient administration of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator from Idaho if there is any objection on the part of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to the reference of the bill again to the committee?

Mr. HEYBURN. The committee has considered this matter. There is no occasion for making special notice of the fact that the bill was reported by the Senator from Massachusetts. The committee have agreed that it should go back to the committee. I see some members present.

Mr. BRISTOW. May I inquire, being a member of that committee, as I had not heard anything about this reference, what is the purpose of it?

Mr. HEYBURN. The committee reported a measure for regulating the financing of the construction of railroads and public works in the Philippine Islands. After the report was made it was discovered that it was impossible to procure the consideration of the financial agencies at all. We will reconsider it, when they shall appear before the committee, as the committee may have time. But the request comes from the department in charge of the Philippine affairs. I think the Senator, being a member of the committee, understands the matter.

Mr. BRISTOW. I understand the amendments suggested, of course. I was very much in favor of those amendments, which I understand the financiers object to.

Mr. HEYBURN. They do. They will not even consider the proposition. The committee will have to hear them and reconsider the matter.

Mr. BRISTOW. I suppose the bill will have to go back to the committee, probably, and be fought out there, and, perhaps, afterwards on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HEYBURN. We could make no headway here at all. We had just as well send the bill back to the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. SMOOT. The only reason I brought the question up was on account of the absence of the Senator from Massachusetts. I have no objection to the recommitment of the bill.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, it is utterly impossible for us to gather what is going on. The Chair asked if there was objection, but we do not know what the request is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho asked unanimous consent to recommit to the Committee on the Philippines Senate bill 2761, which has heretofore been reported and is now upon the calendar. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bill is recommitted to the Committee on the Philippines.

CONSTITUTIONS OF ARIZONA AND NEW MEXICO.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I desire to give notice that on Tuesday next, immediately after the conclusion of the routine morning business, with the permission of the Senate, I will submit some observations on the New Mexico and Arizona constitutions, with special reference to the initiative, referendum, and recall. (H. J. Res. 14.)

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, the notice given by the Senator from Utah leads me to inquire of the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] if he knows when the report of the Committee on Territories is likely to be filed. The chairman of the committee being absent and the senior Senator from Minnesota being the ranking member, I make the inquiry of him.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I have no information on that point. As the Senator from Kansas knows, I dissented from the report of the majority of the committee. There were three of us who were opposed to the report of the majority of the committee, and I stated to the chairman that I would orally state my objections at the time he reported the bill; but I do not know when he is going to report the bill. In that matter I do not represent the majority of the committee; I represent simply a minority.

Mr. STONE. I desire to ask some Senator on the Committee on Territories, as the chairman of the committee does not seem to be present, whether the bill admitting New Mexico and Arizona has been acted on by the committee and when it is likely to be reported to the Senate?

Mr. SHIVELY. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Missouri I desire to say that the Committee on Territories two weeks ago last Saturday instructed the chairman to report favorably the bill admitting these Territories. As stated a moment ago by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], there were three members of the committee who expressed themselves against the views of the majority. Why the report has not yet been submitted I do not know.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

Mr. PENROSE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the reciprocity bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I desire to submit some remarks upon the bill (S. 1) to establish a department of health, and for other purposes. I am very sorry to interrupt the discussion upon the pending measure providing for reciprocity with Canada, to which Senators have given such great attention and in which they seem to be so deeply and profoundly interested. I am moved, however, to speak upon this subject at the present time by some remarks that were made by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] a few days ago on the same subject. What the Senator himself said was very brief and called for no reply. He took that occasion, however, to read into the records of the Senate articles that had been published in Collier's Weekly and in the Journal of the Medical Association that do call for prompt answer. In order that the views of the Senator from Oklahoma may be understood, I desire to quote briefly from the speech that he made on that occasion. He said:

Great and organized opposition to the establishment of a department of health has been carried on by a so-called League for Medical Freedom. This league has many good people in it who are misled—Christian Scientists who deny disease, and some good citizens who have been falsely led to believe their liberty will be invaded—some people who do not think, and some people who have an evil purpose, a sinister commercial purpose, who are engaged in promoting patent medicine.

Again, he said:

Mr. President, I opened my remarks by saying that there were many most excellent people who were members of the League for Medical Freedom, so called, many of whom are Christian Scientists, who are osteopaths, who are homeopaths, people for whom I have the highest respect, but this description of this league and its officers by Collier's deals directly with the individuals at the head of this organization and points out who those directors are.

Still further he said:

Mr. President, the membership of this so-called league, in my judgment, have been deliberately misled by sinister interests, and the mem-

bership which has been thus added to these alleged rolls of membership has no means of expressing itself. The expression comes through its officers. Those officers are described by Collier's, and I think it would be well for the membership of that organization to look to the directors and see who they are and understand what is at the bottom of this movement. That is the purpose of my reading into the Record the history of this so-called organization.

I desire also to read very briefly from the editorial read into the Record by the Senator from Oklahoma. This is not from Collier's, it will be understood, but from the Journal of the American Medical Association:

I want to say right here that in my State half-page advertisements in huge letters were spread all over that State by this so-called League for Medical Freedom, practically denouncing the medical profession of this country as being a "medical trust," desirous of depriving citizens of their rights to employ any physician they pleased, to use any medicine they pleased, and giving it to be understood that the purpose of a department of health was the invasion of the private home of the citizen and the invasion of the constitutional rights of the State. The members of the so-called League for Medical Freedom have been grossly imposed upon and have been grossly misrepresented as to what they truly stand for. I know what many of their members stand for perfectly well, and I am in accord with them cordially and sincerely. I know what the Christian Scientists stand for, and I sympathize with them; I understand what the osteopaths stand for, too, and I think they serve a good and useful purpose. They have been misled by the agents of the patent-medicine association in this country, that are actively engaged in promoting the drug habit in our citizens, and this declaration on the part of the so-called League for Medical Freedom against the American Medical Association is not only unjust and unfair, but it is disgraceful and utterly untrustworthy.

WHO ARE OPPOSING THE BILL.

Mr. President, it will be seen that complaint is made that the League for Medical Freedom is not acting in good faith, but that it is being used for sinister and mercenary purposes by manufacturers and dealers in patent medicines. I am quite sure from the well-known views of the Senator from Oklahoma that he would not for a moment justify any act of oppression such as is attempted in this case through the columns of Collier's, knowing as I do that he stands the champion of the rights of the people and civil liberty. Therefore in what I expect to say with respect to these publications and their utterances I am not treating them as the utterances of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. President, this is an important subject. It is one that calls for the utmost frankness in dealing with it. I know how much the Senator from Oklahoma has at heart the measure that he is pressing for consideration before the Senate, and I desire to say that I respect his views in regard to that matter, but I differ from him wholly.

I am going to discuss this question from the standpoint of a Christian Scientist, and in order that the Senate may better understand and appreciate that point of view I am going to give you in just a few words my own personal experience with Christian Science healing.

Ten years ago I was a scoffer at Christian Science; I derided and ridiculed the claim of the Christian Scientists to heal disease; but the time was to come, and that very soon, when I was to put those pretensions and claims to the test. I had been an invalid and a great sufferer from a complication of diseases for many years. During the last year before I came to Christian Science for help those diseases took on an acute form and I suffered intensely night and day. In that space of time I lost 30 pounds in flesh and had become correspondingly weak. I was unable to do my day's work. I felt that the time had just about come when I should be compelled to give up my work and that death was near at hand. I had tried all schools of medical physicians; I had gone to what is known as the old school or the regular school of physicians; I had tried the homeopathic physicians. I finally went for relief to the osteopaths, who conceived the idea that my sufferings and the headaches which I had endured all that time were the result of the displacement of one of the vertebrae that pressed upon the spinal cord and caused all of my troubles. I obtained no relief from any of these sources. I am not here for the purpose of criticizing the work that was done by the physicians. They did the very best they could for me, and one and all of them worked conscientiously in the effort to relieve me from my troubles. They were competent men in their professions; I have not in anything that I may say here any word of condemnation or criticism to pass upon the physician who was doing his work conscientiously as such; but I found that my relief did not lie there.

I had said that, while I had no faith in it, while, as I said a few moments ago, I scoffed at the very idea that such diseases as mine could be cured by Christian Science, if everything failed, then I would try that remedy. I did so; and from the time that I commenced taking the treatment I began to improve, and that improvement was steady day by day for the space of about four months, when I could say to myself that I was completely healed. I had come up out of that condition of suffering and distress day by day just as I had gone down into that condition day by day in the years that had passed.

My wife, who had been an invalid for 15 years or more, at my earnest solicitation commenced to take the treatment at the same time that I did. She had been told—something that is nowadays almost inevitable in cases like that—she had been told that the only thing which could relieve her from her condition was the surgeon's knife. She was healed of that condition in three treatments by Christian Science, and from that time until now, almost nine years, she has been a comparatively healthy woman.

But the one thing that seemed to appeal to us more than anything else, in our experience, was the fact that our son was healed of the drink habit that had fastened upon him after he had arrived at manhood and had completely taken possession of him, so that we took him into our home and nursed him like a child. After our experience in Christian Science, naturally we undertook to induce him to resort to the same remedy, but, like thousands of others, he was not willing to accept it; he was not willing even to give it a trial until almost a year after we had had our experience. When he was just recovering from the effects of one of the prolonged spells of drinking to which he was addicted, he said one morning to his mother: "I know what Christian Science has done for you and father; I have always believed that I could overcome this habit of my own will, but now I give it up. If you desire, you may call a Christian Science practitioner."

We called a Christian Science practitioner that day, and he has not taken a drink of liquor from that time until now, almost seven years; and, best of all, while he had struggled against the habit, while he had at one time overcome it for the length of 11 months, yet the desire for it, the torture of the appetite, was with him every day. But when he had taken the treatment that desire for drink was completely and absolutely destroyed, and has never returned. Mr. President, that is the experience of one family in Christian Science. It is the experience in greater or less degree of hundreds of families in this country.

I fancy I hear Senators saying to themselves it is all a delusion; but I want to say to Senators that if it is, I hope that delusion will not be dispelled. It has brought health and happiness and contentment into hundreds of families in this country. It is doing that sort of work every day, day by day, healing the sick, saving men and women from suffering and sin, and in thousands of instances has saved them from the surgeon's knife, the resort to which is so common at the present time.

Mr. President, Christian Scientists do not claim to be perfect in their work of healing disease—not by any means. There has been but one perfect Healer on earth. Even His own disciples failed sometimes and met with the rebuke from Him, "Oh, ye of little faith."

I want to say to Senators that Christian Scientists are in no sense hostile to the medical profession, as is very generally believed. You have never found them in any single instance opposing any sort of legislation that tends to increase the efficiency of the medical profession, of whatever school it may be. We recognize the fact that there is work for all of us to do. We recognize the fact that the medical profession in their different schools are doing a great work in alleviating human suffering and healing disease. Therefore it is no part of the work of a Christian Scientist to interfere in any way whatever with the work of the medical profession.

I want to add that in whatever I may say in criticism of what has taken place on the part of the American Medical Association I am not criticising individuals. I reckon among my very best friends, and men for whom I have the highest possible respect, some of the men who are in the medical profession in this country, and I appreciate the work they are now doing in ameliorating human suffering.

Mr. President, the first thing to which I desire to address myself is the claim made in the articles that have been read in the Record by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], that the League for Medical Freedom is, if not made up by, actually influenced and controlled by selfish interests, by the vendors and manufacturers of patent medicines.

I want right in the beginning to deny that assertion emphatically and without qualification. I know something about the composition of the League for Medical Freedom. I know that the people who are standing behind that league and undertaking to prevent the kind of legislation that is sought here in Congress and throughout the States are people who are simply standing for the principle that every sort of healing medium, whether it be the doctors of this profession or that profession, this school or that school, or whatever it may be, shall have the right and freedom to exercise their rights as American citizens in that direction as well as all others. It is for the very reason that the American Medical Association has for the past 20 years been seeking legislation in the various States of

this country that would shut out and prevent the exercise of the power of healing disease on the part of others that this opposition has arisen, and for no other reason.

Mr. President, as to the composition of the League for Medical Freedom, I desire first to call attention to an extract from the address of ex-Gov. Bates, of Massachusetts, a distinguished lawyer and statesman, who appeared in behalf of the league before the House committee having under consideration a bill similar to the one now before the Senate. In opening his remarks on that occasion he stated in general terms of whom the league was composed, as follows:

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I appreciate your courtesy and assure you that I will try to keep within the time, although it is possible I may so abbreviate my remarks as not to take the full amount allotted to me. I represent here to-night the organization known as the National League for Medical Freedom. This is a recently formed organization. Its president is B. O. Flower, editor and founder of the Arena and editor of the Twentieth Century Magazine, of Boston. Its vice president is Hon. Charles W. Miller, ex-chairman of the Iowa Democratic State committee. Its secretary is A. P. Harsch, president of the Clinton-Close Co., of Toledo, Ohio, and upon its advisory board are, among others, the following: William D. Baldwin, president Otis Elevator Co., New York; Orison Swett Marden, editor Success, New York; Lewis Pinkerton Crutcher, M. D., faculty Hahnemann Homeopathic Medical College, Kansas City, Mo.; A. T. Still, M. D., founder Osteopathy, Kirksville, Mo.; William Ordway Partridge, sculptor, New York City; Charles M. Carr, editor N. A. R. D. Notes, official organ of the National Association Retail Druggists, Chicago, Ill.; Hon. John D. Johnson, Johnson, Rule & Allen, attorneys, St. Louis, Mo.; Dr. Orton K. Thompson, faculty Hering Homeopathic College, Chicago, Ill.; A. E. Stillwell, president K. C., M. & O. R. R., New York City; George P. Engelhard, editor Medical Standard, Chicago, Ill.; John Alexander Cooper, certified public accountant, Chicago, Ill.; Mrs. Diana Belais, president New York Anti-Visitation Society, New York; Edwin C. Pickler, D. O., president American Osteopathic Association; Claude E. Laws, M. D., president Arkansas State Eclectic Board of Medical Examiners; Simon Nusbaum, National Bank of Commerce, New York City; Arthur Heurtley, secretary Northern Trust Co., Chicago, Ill.; Chester A. Tousey, president Tousey Varnish Co., Chicago, Ill.; Frank A. Spink, traffic manager Chicago & Western Indiana Railroad, Chicago, Ill.; Charles Huhn, president National Association Retail Druggists, Minneapolis, Minn.; Mrs. John A. Logan, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. George T. Oliver, Pittsburg, Pa.; Hon. Hobart M. Cable, jr., Cable Piano Co., Chicago, Ill.; John E. Carson, capitalist, Oklahoma City, Okla.; J. T. Holleman, president Union Savings Bank, Atlanta, Ga.; Hon. A. S. Mann, Jacksonville, Fla.; Benage S. Joslyn, president Portland Railway, Light & Power Co., Portland, Ore.; Hon. George Birmingham, El Reno, Okla.; Sam T. Cochran, grand commander Knights Templar, Dallas, Tex.; Arthur N. McGeoch, capitalist, Milwaukee, Wis.; Hon. Charles Major, author, Shelbyville, Ind.; C. W. Snyder, president Topeka State Bank, Topeka, Kans.; Charles A. Bookwalter, ex-mayor, Indianapolis, Ind.; Judge Oliver C. McGelvera, Seattle, Wash.; Hon. W. B. Martin, executive, Des Moines, Iowa (secretary of state); Prof. E. L. Martin, Macon, Ga.; W. C. Lewis, banker, Tallahassee, Fla.; William S. Crowell, president, First National Bank, Medford, Ore.; Hon. B. M. Parmenter, Lawton, Okla.; and others.

Mr. Chairman, I have stated that this league is a recent organization. It has a membership numbered by the tens of thousands, and applications for membership are coming in literally by the thousands every day. It partakes of the nature of a spontaneous movement more, I believe, than any which has appeared in connection with this matter. Let me read just a few telegrams and letters, or extracts from them, received to-day. I shall not attempt to read but three or four. Here is one from Los Angeles, Cal.:

[Telegram.]

LOS ANGELES, CAL., May 17, 1910.

WILLARD S. MATTOX,

406 Metropolitan Bank Building, Washington, D. C.:

Use following on advisory board: Hon. Thomas Early, mayor, Pasadena; Dr. A. P. Graves, D. D., 434 West Twentieth Street, Los Angeles. Estimated membership of league here to date, 500. Have enlisted papers in our behalf. Strong influence being used here in favor of bill. No literature received yet; will use immediately. No newspaper notice of league has appeared. Will do anything to aid you in this work.

Here is one from Des Moines:

[Telegram.]

DES MOINES, IOWA, May 19, 1910.

JOHN M. READ,

New Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

More than 2,000 voters to date protest in name of Iowa Voters and Taxpayers' Association against passage of Senate bill. List is being rapidly swelled.

Here is one from Concord, N. H.:

[Telegram.]

CONCORD, N. H., May 18, 1910.

WILLARD S. MATTOX,

406 Metropolitan Bank Building, Washington, D. C.:

Following persons on record against class medical legislation and permit use of names on advisory board National League for Medical Freedom: Ex-Gov. Charles M. Floyd; Oliver E. Branch, attorney Boston & Maine Railroad; Col. Solon A. Carter, State treasurer; Hon. Ira E. Gray, member State legislature; Dr. John H. Worthen; Fremont E. Shurtleff, lawyer; others by mail to New York.

C. B. JAMIESON.

Here is one from the father of osteopathy:

[Telegram.]

KIRKSVILLE, MO., May 18.

B. O. FLOWER,

Care New Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

I am not only not supporting Senator Owen bill, but opposed to it.

DR. A. T. STILL,

"Father" of Osteopathy, Founder of the School.

Here is one from the faculty of the Hering Medical College, Chicago:

[Telegram.]

CHICAGO, ILL., May 19, 1910.

B. O. FLOWER,

Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

I am opposed to Owen bill, and know that the homeopathic profession of State are opposed to same.

ORION KEMPER THOMSON, M. D.,
Faculty Hering Medical College, Chicago.

Here is one from Missouri:

[Telegram.]

KANSAS CITY, MO., May 19, 1910.

B. O. FLOWER,

New Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

Homeopaths Missouri and Kansas joint session here protest against passage Owen bill.

LEWIS P. CRUTCHER, M. D.

Here is one from New York:

[Telegram.]

NEW YORK, May 19, 1910.

B. O. FLOWER,

New Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

Following telegram from Lansing, Mich.: "Am against any law or measure such as would result from the passage of Owen bill. (Signed) Richard Simmons, M. D."

NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR MEDICAL FREEDOM,
By J. R. KATHRENS.

Here is one from Watertown, S. Dak.:

[Telegram.]

NEW YORK, May 19.

B. O. FLOWER,

New Willard, Washington, D. C.:

Just received the following wire from Watertown, S. Dak.: "C. E. Schoolcraft, M. D. D. O., president State Society Osteopathy for South Dakota, will cheerfully act on advisory board. (Signed) John D. Carle."

NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR MEDICAL FREEDOM,
By J. R. KATHRENS.

Here is one from New York City, just received as I came in:

[Telegram.]

NEW YORK, May 19, 1910.

B. O. FLOWER,

New Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

This office has received individual telegrams from the following cities giving the number of enrollments received and mailed to-day: Baltimore, 340; Chattanooga, Tenn., 105; Nashville, 75; Memphis, 357; Cleveland, 2,000; Knoxville, Tenn., 90; Louisville, Ky., 140.

NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR MEDICAL FREEDOM,
By J. R. KATHRENS.

Here is one from the office in New York:

[Telegram.]

NEW YORK, May 19.

B. O. FLOWER,

New Willard, Washington, D. C.:

The names of 126 eclectic practitioners have been enrolled by this league yesterday and to-day.

NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR MEDICAL FREEDOM,
By J. R. KATHRENS.

Another telegram from New York:

[Telegram.]

NEW YORK, May 19, 1910.

B. O. FLOWER,

New Willard, Washington, D. C.:

We have the names of 140 old-school doctors who have declared in favor of medical freedom and who lend their names and moral support to your movement.

NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR MEDICAL FREEDOM,
By J. R. KATHRENS.

Here is another one:

[Telegram.]

NEW YORK, May 19, 1910.

B. O. FLOWER,

New Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

Three hundred and forty osteopath practitioners have already joined this league and many more coming in with each mail delivery. Total number of enrollments up to noon to-day, 22,800.

NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR MEDICAL FREEDOM,
By J. R. KATHRENS.

Here is another one:

[Telegram.]

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., May 19, 1910.

Hon. CHARLES A. BOOKWALTER,

Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

A medical trust would be a national calamity. In fighting it you are doing humanity a noble service.

DR. J. A. HOUSER.

Here is a letter from the president of the Ohio Optical Association (reading):

COLUMBUS, OHIO, May 17, 1910.

B. O. FLOWER, Esq.,

Metropolitan Building, New York City.

MY DEAR MR. FLOWER: I read of your work in the Cincinnati Enquirer, and am heart and soul in sympathy with you. The above organization, of which I am president, has just given the A. M. A. a good tussle, and they knew they were in a fight. Also we were victors in the general assembly, and now have a bill awaiting the governor's signature before it becomes a law. The opticians have a national organization composed of various State associations, and we will meet at Cedar Point, August 15 to 18, and I think that in view of the fact that we have been victorious in 24 States, and are still fighting the medical trust in all the others, we might be of mutual aid. I will lend you all the assistance within my power as an individual, for I do not believe any man who has had any experience in combating the selfish and intolerant element that composes the A. M. A. but what will do yeoman service for his fellow man. If I can be of any service to you, I will consider it a favor to be called on as a volunteer. With best wishes for your success, I am,

Your obedient servant,

C. M. McDONNELL,
21 East State Street, Columbus, Ohio.

I have read these merely to give a general idea of the breadth of this movement and of the alacrity with which the people are sending in their names for the purpose of joining the league.

The purpose of this organization, as stated in its prospectus, is "the maintenance of the rights of the American people against unnecessary, unjust, oppressive, fraternal, and un-American laws, ostensibly related to the subject of health. * * * It seeks through publicity and education to unmask and oppose any legislation which endeavors to put into power any one system of healing and use the Government prestige, money, and machinery to enforce its theories and opinions upon citizens who believe in other forms of healing."

It is as essential to liberty of the individual to have medical freedom as it is to have political or religious freedom. In fact, medical freedom comes possibly closer to his interest, to his material welfare than either of the others. It affects life itself.

This organization, that in a few days has secured 50,000 members and that is confidently expected will have 100,000 members within two weeks, is made up largely of those who have been for years individually interested in defending that freedom for the maintenance of which they have now organized. It is a popular movement. Ten thousand applied for membership yesterday alone. It is the only popular movement here represented.

It has become almost as regular as the sessions of the legislatures themselves for attempts to be made in each State in the Union to pass legislation that will either restrict the practice of medicine to those who have pursued certain courses or that indirectly seek to gain the same object by prohibiting pay for services and similar devices. The people whom I represent believe that every man has a right to select his own physician and to seek remedy and relief wherever he can find it. They know that the attempts to restrict the practice of healing, or of medicine, to certain schools of medicine has been largely the result of the efforts and endeavors of the members of those schools of medicine who would be benefited by such legislation.

Among other States where such attempts have been made, and are being repeatedly made, I will mention New York, Washington, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, Nebraska, Colorado, Iowa, Kentucky, Tennessee, Maine, Alabama, Louisiana, Missouri, Michigan, California, Utah, Montana, North Carolina, New Jersey, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Arizona, and Connecticut, and my own State, Massachusetts.

In all these States such efforts have been defeated. In Maryland, Ohio, Virginia, Texas, and Delaware such efforts have been partially successful. It is not surprising that the people who have made the contests against this restrictive legislation for years in these various States look with suspicion upon the efforts of the American Medical Society, to pass the legislation now proposed, particularly in view of the fact that admittedly for 20 years this society has been endeavoring to obtain just such legislation, while during that period through its various members it has been endeavoring to obtain restrictive legislation in the States.

Mr. President, I have some personal knowledge of the efforts that have been made in my own State to bring about just such legislation as this. We have been compelled to meet it at every session of the legislature in our State for years past. It has not stopped at the effort to elevate and make more efficient the medical profession to which no one has ever objected. It has gone further than that and attempted by legislation to exclude everybody else from practicing at all. For a long time it was directed at the Homeopathic School of Medicine, until that school became so strong that it was useless to attempt longer anything of that sort. Then it followed in the case of others and finally came down to the Christian Scientists, and for the past 8 or 10 years the effort of the American Medical Association has been to secure some sort of legislation that would absolutely bar the Christian Scientists from all opportunity to exercise their right of healing disease.

Four years ago, in my own State, a bill having that object was introduced into the legislature. I happened to know the member who introduced it. I telegraphed him my desire to be heard with respect to it before the bill was passed. He examined the bill and let me know that he did not understand the full scope and effect of it, and that he himself would not support it until Christian Scientists were relieved and excepted from its effects.

We have had to keep vigilant watch constantly in my State. I know it is just as true with respect to other States; and back of all this effort to keep everybody else out of the practice of healing disease has been the American Medical Association, not always openly, sometimes they pushed somebody else to the front, but you will always find behind it the force and power of the American Medical Association.

That is just exactly the condition that exists with respect to the bill now before the Senate. You hear a great deal said about the committee of 100 having been before the committees that have investigated this matter, and one would suppose by reading the report of the investigation that it was the committee of 100 that was urging upon the Senate, upon Congress, the enactment of laws of this kind.

But I want to say to the Senators here that behind the committee of 100 is the American Medical Association. Not only so, but practically one-third of the members of the committee of 100 are doctors belonging to the regular school of medicine, and one of them is the man who has been most active in pushing this kind of legislation, Dr. McCormick, who, in a sense, is the walking delegate of the American Medical Association, and who absolutely controls and dominates not only that association, but the committee of 100.

I desire also to read very briefly from a letter of Mr. H. E. Lesan to myself, giving an account of the elements which compose the League for Medical Freedom:

There are now a little over 200,000 members of the National League for Medical Freedom, and I should say that from one-third to one-half of them are Christian Scientists.

I should say, however, that 25 per cent more were sympathizers with the right of the Christian Scientists to practice, even if they were not adherents, so that I should say that 60 to 75 per cent of the membership of the league was secured from the Christian Science influence.

There are 10,000 physicians of all schools, being probably more osteopaths than any others; next to that eclectics, then homeopaths, and then chiropractics, with a very good sprinkling of allopathic physicians, who belong to the league as a protest against the political methods of the American Medical Association.

The greater number of Christian Scientists in the League for Medical Freedom calls for explanation. The Christian Scientists as a body have taken no part whatever in this movement. They are not represented as a body in the League for Medical Freedom. Every Christian Scientist who becomes a member of the league becomes such individually and upon his own volition. No effort has ever been made to induce or coerce any Christian Scientist to take any part in a movement of this kind, and the reason why there are a greater number of them is simply this: The individuals are acting, so far as the Christian Scientists are concerned, but in the case of medical schools that are interested in this matter, they are represented not by individuals; thousands of those who believe in those schools of medicine are represented by the physicians who belong to certain organizations, and while the Christian Scientists appear for that reason to be stronger, they are not so in fact, because the physicians and the heads of these medical organizations are in fact representing thousands and thousands of people who are standing out against this sort of legislation, but whose names do not appear as members.

There is another thing that I should say in this connection, as I am speaking from the standpoint of the Christian Scientist, in justice to the members of the different medical organizations who are acting with us in this matter. It does not follow by any means because members, for example, of the homeopathic school of medicine are uniting with the Christian Scientists in opposing this bill that they are in sympathy with or believe in Christian Science—not by any means.

Just so with all of the other medical professions. It does not follow that because they are making common cause in a fight of this kind that each one of them believes in the method of healing that is resorted to by the other, and therefore I think it is only just for me to say that because members of the medical profession are joining with us in this effort to prevent this sort of legislation it is not because of any sympathies they have for the Christian Scientists as such, but because they themselves are interested in preventing the passage of the bill.

I want to say to Senators here that this movement in opposition to this bill is not confined to members of any profession or any school of medicine or healing. There are thousands of independent American citizens in this country who object to such legislation, without respect to the effect it is going to have upon their interests or upon their schools of medicine. They object to it because it is unjust and un-American.

I have here a letter from Mr. B. O. Flower, the president of the League for Medical Freedom. I am not going to take up the time of the Senate in reading it. It explains of what the league is composed. But I ask leave to print it as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

The letter referred to is as follows:

BOSTON, MASS., July 1, 1911.

HON. JOHN D. WORKS,

United States Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have just returned from two days spent at our New York office. Much of the time while there was spent in getting into shape the data to be sent to you. I requested our people to get a complete list of the executive officers of the league—a list that would include not only the officers and advisory board of the national league, but also the executive officers of the State branches. This amounts to about 500 names in all; and I requested them to indicate the strong men and their position. For example, the chairman of the Virginia League, Dr. Crutcher tells me, is probably the most prominent homeopathic physician in Virginia, a man of influence in Richmond, and of great ability.

The chairman of our league in Florida is probably the most prominent homeopathic physician in that State. As you know, the officers of the San Francisco league are men prominent in public life. In our Massachusetts league Dr. Maurice Worcester Turner was last year president of the International Hahnemann Society. He was for several years instructor in the Boston University School of Medicine, and is one of the prominent homeopathic physicians of the land. The secretary of our league is the proprietor of one of the large and beautiful family hotels of Cambridge, and a man who has been on the governor's council in the past, and is quite prominent in Republican politics of the State as well as a prominent business man. The treasurer and assistant treasurer are men of prominence, one a retired capitalist and the other a banker. Dr. William Leonard, who writes in the June number of the magazine against restrictive medical legislation, is a member of our advisory board, and has worked for us from the first. He was for 19 years professor of materia medica in the University of Minnesota, and is one of the prominent homeopathic physicians of the country. Dr. A. F. Stephens, of St. Louis, another member of our advisory board, is one of the most prominent medical authors, edu-

cators, and physicians in the eclectic school. I sent you a few days ago Dr. Munk's strong indorsement of the league's work as president of the National Eclectic Association. I mention these physicians for the reason that a persistent attempt has been made by Senator OWEN and the advocates of State medicine to convey the idea that the homeopathic and eclectic schools of medicine are not in sympathy with our light, and a persistent attempt has been made to alienate the physicians of these schools from us, and inasmuch as Collier's and Senator OWEN, through reading Collier's article and thus indorsing it, have tried to convey the impression that the management of the league is discreditable, it seemed to me that if 25 or 35 very prominent business, professional, literary, and educational names should be mentioned as officials of the league and as representative of those constituting the executive branch of the league and its State branches, it would most effectively silence this attempt to discredit the league.

After one year's search Collier's have not been able to find 10 persons connected with the league against whom they dared to make charges, and even in these instances a large number of the statements made were deliberate misrepresentations, and other statements were made for the purpose of trying to convey a false impression to the public mind.

Cordially, yours,

B. O. FLOWER.

WHO IS SUPPORTING THE BILL.

Mr. WORKS. Now, after having discussed thus briefly and imperfectly the opposition to the bill, I desire to say something about who it is that is undertaking to bring about the enactment of this bill.

In the first place, I desire to read very briefly from a report of J. N. McCormack, M. D., chairman of the committee on organization of the American Medical Association.

Senators will bear in mind that the impression has gone forth that this legislation is being pressed by the committee of 100, composed of people who are entirely disinterested, and my desire is to show, as I said a while ago, that while that appears to be so, as a matter of fact it is being pressed by the American Medical Association practically and alone. Dr. McCormack says:

Accounts of my itineraries in New England and the Northwest were given such publicity in American Medical Association and State journals at the time that I shall confine this report to the subject of national health legislation, which was put so prominently before the profession by the action of this House two years ago and has been kept constantly before it by the indefatigable labors of your legislative committee since in an effort to secure a national department of health, the aspiration and hope of this association for half a century.

Sent on to Washington by your legislative committee, after the great speech of Senator OWEN had impressed this country, as Gladstone had done England a few decades before, "that care for the public health is the first and highest duty of the statesman," I found many leading men of both Houses outspoken in support of the principles of his bill, and a number of our most experienced friends believed that there was an excellent chance to perfect and pass it at the present session of the Congress. After looking over the ground and conferring with Drs. Sower, Wiley, Kober, Woodward, Owen, and others—and I have never seen men more devoted and earnest in a cause—the hearings were arranged, and it is believed that few measures of such a nature were ever more ably supported.

I am inclined to agree with that, Mr. President. I do not think there has ever been a measure before the Congress of the United States which has been more earnestly supported by any body of people than this legislation has been supported by the American Medical Association.

More important was an opposition due to a conflict of interest between the bureaus and divisions directly affected by the proposed transfer to the new health department, about which there might well be honest difference of opinion. This occasioned much anxiety to the friends of the legislation, and the ablest men in the profession came on to Washington and took part in the negotiations to meet the difficulty. These negotiations were continued here, and I am happy to inform you that, under the sagacious leadership of Drs. Welch and Gorgas, great enough to give proper consideration to every interest, an agreement has been reached.

Dr. Welch was at that time, as I remember it, president of the American Medical Association; if not, he was so later, and I believe he has just retired from that position at an election which has been held at the city of Los Angeles, my home.

It will be seen that there was a conflict between the authors of the American Medical Association and the constituted medical authorities of the Government then existing, including the Public Health and National Quarantine Service. It is perfectly evident that some sort of a bargain was made between the representatives of the Government in that bureau and the American Medical Association which was entirely satisfactory to the association.

We are to have a health department commensurate with the powers and resources of our Government, and in time our country is to be put in the front rank in the field of preventive medicine. In accordance with that agreement and by authority I now offer the following—

I think Senators would like very much to know what sort of an agreement that was. I know I would, and I think the people of this country have a right to know what sort of a bargain was made by the medical bureau of this Government and the American Medical Association which brought about this compromise. Here is the resolution that was offered by Dr. McCormack—

Resolved, That the president be, and is hereby, authorized to appoint a committee of seven members, which shall be charged with the duty of framing a bill for a national department of health, to be presented to the next session of Congress in December, and that this committee shall

consider and determine all matters and policies relating to national health legislation, and may invite the cooperation and cooperate with other organizations having the same purpose in view.

So we see that at that particular time the American Medical Association was quite active in bringing about this legislation. Nothing was heard at that time about the committee of 100 that was supposed to be acting disinterestedly.

I desire also to read briefly from a letter of the president of the committee of 100 to show what sort of action was being taken by the committee, engineered, as I believe and as I assert here, by the American Medical Association, with Dr. McCormack at its head. They have been complaining of the League for Medical Freedom that it had been expending large sums of money in sending telegrams to Members of Congress and in various other ways. This letter shows that the committee of 100 has not been free from that same weakness.

Prof. Irving Fisher, a very distinguished and estimable gentleman, against whom I have nothing whatever to say, acting, I have not the slightest doubt, with perfect sincerity in this matter, in the belief that he was doing something of benefit to the American people, said in this letter:

Our legislative subcommittee and executive subcommittee have held frequent meetings. We believe that it is not possible to overcome the opposition unless a campaign fund of from \$20,000 to \$25,000 can be raised at once. This will be used for printing, stationery, telegrams, etc., the effect of which will be that Congressmen, especially pivotal Congressmen, will not dare to displease their constituents by opposing President Taft's program. It will also be used to reach our American Health League—which contains many thousand health enthusiasts—to start up our Authors' League of 1,000 health writers, to stimulate our press council of 100 leading editors, and to supply them and the members generally with ammunition in the way of literature; also to reach the labor organizations and the Grange and all our allies. * * *

I am writing to you among the first, knowing that you keenly appreciate the importance of overcoming the selfish opposition to a project which, once started, will surely expand within a decade so that millions upon millions of Government money will be put into this most needed form of national defense.

There is no selfishness about that, I presume. Nobody is to be benefited by the expenditure of these millions and millions of dollars that were to be expended by the department that is proposed to be organized.

Letters received from Congressmen in response to our effort to poll them on this question show that many of them, and especially those who control procedure, need something more than the President's message to urge them to action; in short, that they must have letters and telegrams from their constituents.

In order to show something about the estimation in which the American Medical Association is held in so far as it is attempting to control legislation of this kind, I want to read an extract from the testimony of Henry R. Strong, which was given before the House committee on this subject; and right in this connection I want to make a distinction in the criticism that I make against the American Medical Association between what I regard as its legitimate business, the building up of the efficiency of its own body, the effort that it is making to bring about better conditions in its own profession, and its attempt at legislation of this kind that shall give it an undue advantage over others who are undertaking to do the same kind of work. I have no criticism to make of the American Medical Association so long as it is following out the purposes and objects I have indicated.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. WORKS. Certainly.

Mr. OWEN. If it would not interrupt the Senator from California, I should like to call his attention to section 3 of the proposed bill, which expressly forbids discrimination in favor of or against any school or system of medicine.

Mr. WORKS. I am coming to that, if the Senator will allow me, and when I reach that point I shall be glad to submit to any question which the Senator may desire to ask. At this time it would be inappropriate.

Mr. OWEN. Very well; I will wait.

Mr. WORKS. I will then be glad to submit to any suggestion which the Senator has to make in that connection. The statement of Mr. Strong is as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Henry R. Strong. Ten minutes have been allotted to you, Mr. Strong.

Mr. STRONG. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, with all due respect to those who have appeared before this committee, I desire to say that I am in sympathy with neither the homeopaths, the eclectics, the osteopaths, the Christian Scientists, nor any nor either of the so-called sects, if I may so call them, that I suppose are behind this league. My sympathies, as are my interests, are with and bound up with the so-called school of regular physicians, but I believe that if this bill is passed it will accomplish a state establishment of medicine in this country, and I believe such was the purpose of those with whom this movement originated some six or eight years ago.

I refer, Mr. Chairman, to a clique of political doctors who have captured the control of the organization of the American Medical Association, who are falsely pretending to represent the regular physicians of this country. The fact of the matter is that the American Medical

Association itself does not have 80,000 members, as the gentlemen who have addressed you stated it had. It has only 30,000 or 40,000, although by coercive methods the membership is rapidly growing. Therefore, as I say, the clique in control of the association does not fairly represent the association, nor does the association represent the profession as a whole.

HOW THE EFFORTS OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION TO SECURE LEGISLATION IS VIEWED BY OTHERS.

Mr. President, in order to bring to the attention of Senators the position that is taken by others besides Christian Scientists with respect to this matter, I desire to call attention to resolutions which were adopted by the Eclectic Medical Society of the State of California, at Redlands, Cal., on June 2, 1911:

ECLECTIC MEDICAL SOCIETY
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
Redlands, Cal., June 2, 1911.

DEAR SIR: The following resolution was unanimously passed at the meeting of the California State Eclectic Medical Society, held in San Francisco, May 23 to 25:

Whereas there has been introduced at the present extra session of Congress the so-called Owen bill, which is designed to eventually establish a State medicine; and

Whereas a State medicine is, equally with a State religion, contrary to a republican form of government and obnoxious to its people: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Eclectic Medical Society of the State of California, in its thirty-eighth annual session, and representing 300 registered physicians, is unalterably opposed to Federal or State compulsory medical laws unless such acts preserve the absolute independence of the physician and citizen to use and employ the system of treatment most consistent with their choice or belief, in the same manner as the rights and privileges of all citizens are now guaranteed with respect to politics and religion.

Resolved, That the secretary be instructed to mail a copy of this resolution to President Taft and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress; also to Gov. Johnson and to each of the senators and assemblymen of the State of California.

O. C. WELBOURN.
ALBERT J. ATKINS.
GEO. G. GERE.
ORAN NEWTON.
L. A. PERCE.
E. R. HARVEY.

As indicating what the feeling of outside people, if I may so call them, is with respect to this sort of legislation which is going on in the States as well as in Congress, I desire now to read an editorial which appeared in the Los Angeles Express only a short time ago bearing upon legislation that was attempted to be passed in the Legislature of California at the session of the legislature just closed.

DOCTORS, TAKE WARNING.

Los Angeles is opposed to the system of medical tyranny over the public schools designed to be established by senate bill No. 733 and assembly bill No. 964. The fathers and mothers of this city will not deliver their children over to the Doctors' Trust those measures would create. If the price of education at the public schools is to be the surrender of all attending scholars to the arbitrary authority of State physicians who will prescribe in bigoted obedience to the requirements of a would-be medical monopoly, Los Angeles will not pay that price.

As the parents of southern California would resist to the uttermost the introduction into the schools of a group of sectarians who should exercise exclusive control over the religious teaching of their children, so will they resist the proposed surrender of their children to a Medical Trust. As the public schools, attended by children of all religious creeds, must be kept free from the dominating influence of any single creed, so must they be kept free from the dominating influence of any single school of medicine.

We are of the race that during these centuries has won liberty of conscience and freedom of belief. As no State would now dare direct how the children in its schools should worship God, so should no State dare attempt to compel such children to submission to the tenets of some particular school of medicine. If, in opposition to the beliefs and convictions of parents, their children are to be treated and prescribed for by State practitioners exercising arbitrary authority in aid of the establishment of a medical monopoly, it will not be long before State clergymen, representing some State creed, will be given exclusive control over their religious beliefs.

Let the legislature make no mistake in its judgment of public sentiment as to this proposal. All else that it has done, important as its work has been, sinks into insignificance beside this act that is proposed. If the legislature aids the Doctors' Trust to this attempted seizure of the public schools it will become infamous. If it attempts to compel the boys and girls of California to submit themselves to the arbitrary control of monopolistic medical arrogance it will become odious and hateful. No legislation of this character should receive an instant's consideration. It were suitable to the period in which men were burned at the stake because they chose to worship God in accordance with their consciences, but it has no place in this century of freedom and enlightenment.

The Express attacks no school of medicine, but no school of medicine shall attack the liberties of the people. California is free from medical tyranny. Let it remain so. It has no State religion. Let it not establish a State system of medicine. Should physicians of any school be given power to examine and prescribe for children because they are scholars, presently they would be given authority to examine and prescribe for men and women because they are citizens. The schools now are free and they must be kept free. Neither sectarianism nor medical slavery shall be allowed to overwhelm and destroy them.

I also desire to include in my remarks a short editorial from the Los Angeles Herald, entitled "Menaced by a Doctors' Trust." It is as follows:

MENACED BY A DOCTORS' TRUST.

The attempt by the Mann bill to turn over the public health affairs of the Government to a Doctors' Trust is a most pernicious attempt to legislate in favor of one school of medicine and to lay every home open

to offensive regulations by Government inspectors. The proposed bill would change the name of the existing Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service and delegate to the new body powers that are in violation of the rights of citizenship. All that an inspector would have to do in order to interfere in a case of illness in any home would be to decide in his own mind that the disease might interfere with interstate commerce. Then he is clothed with almost absolute power to take charge of the case, establish rules and regulations, and call in whatever physician he desired, despite family protests.

Back of this bill there is a school of physicians that thus expects to be recognized officially and thus be empowered to force upon the public its own theories for the causes of diseases and its own methods for cures to the exclusion of all other schools and their remedies and plans of treatment.

Under the action of the Mann bill a man's home would cease to be his castle, and he would be at the mercy of an inspector who would have a defense for any act he might commit on the ground that he feared the disease might become a public menace.

There was also at its annual meeting, May 16 and 17, 1911, a resolution on this subject passed by the Indiana Institute of Homeopathy. It is as follows:

Resolutions passed by the Indiana Institute of Homeopathy at its forty-fifth annual session held in Indianapolis, Ind., May 16-17, 1911.

Whereas the National League for Medical Freedom is an organization whose purpose is to serve and perpetuate the personal liberty of the people of the United States as pertains to the choice of medical attendants; and

Whereas this liberty has been and is still threatened by reason of an effort by the American Medical Association to have enacted a bill creating a national health board, with power and authority to interfere with the rights and powers of the individual States to control their internal affairs: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Indiana Institute of Homeopathy, That we hereby indorse the purpose of the National League for Medical Freedom, and we do hereby most earnestly protest against the creation of a national health board with power and authority superior to that invested in the health boards of the individual States; and be it further

Resolved, That we extend our mutual support to Dr. Louis Crutcher as the homeopathic representative on the directorate of the National League for Medical Freedom, and commend his work to all lovers of personal liberty.

I should say in this connection that at one time the National Grange was induced to indorse legislation of this kind, but it evidently found that it had made a mistake, and subsequent to that time the resolutions I am about to read were adopted by the grange:

PUBLIC HEALTH BUREAU.

That there be no ambiguity or misunderstanding to our action and meaning of our position on public health bureau, we add:

"Whereas the resolutions adopted at the forty-third annual session of the National Grange, favoring the consolidation of the various Federal health bureaus, have been used by the committee of 100 on national health as an indorsement of the proposal to create a new Federal department to be called the department of public health; and

"Whereas the attitude of the National Grange in this matter has been misrepresented by the advocates of a public health department; and

"Whereas the creation of such a department would involve the appointment of thousands of unnecessary officeholders and the expenditure of millions of dollars, which could be better devoted to establishing parcels post, aiding the States in their work of road improvement, and other reforms in which the Grange is interested: Therefore

"Resolved, That the National Grange has not and does not indorse a department of public health, and sees no good reason why the farmers of the country should favor the creation of such a department, or any legislation that might be construed as a step in that direction."

The above resolution was passed by the National Grange at its forty-fourth annual session at Atlantic City in 1910.

C. M. FREEMAN,
Secretary National Grange.

I desire also to read briefly from a letter of C. W. Miller, addressed to myself, in which he says:

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 30, 1911.

For the past 11 years Dr. McCormack has been the walking delegate of the Doctors' Trust, traveling from State to State for the purpose of gathering the physicians of every county visited into the organization. His afternoon stunt in each place he visits is to preach "medical economics" (how to get more money) to the physicians, and in the evening address a public gathering on the great need of a health department and the near-divine attributes of the profession that is seeking to lay upon the altar of the public weal the prospects of its own business.

The fee schedule promulgated by Dr. McCormack first appeared in the Journal of the Medical Association on November 28, 1908, afterwards being reprinted in various State medical journals, and it very accurately indicated what the character of his 11 years' work among physicians has been.

Further evidence in this regard and of the flattering results of his work may be found in the report of his stewardship, which he, as chairman of the committee on organization, made to the annual meeting of the American Medical Association in Chicago on June 2-5, 1908. Therein he says:

"For eight years I have been almost a stranger in my home and family that I might serve you. My constant regret has been that my capacity for service has not been greater.

"As a business proposition, on a very conservative estimate, I am convinced that my work has added indirectly hundreds of thousands of dollars to your revenues, but this is the smallest part of it, as will one day be known. At least two carefully selected men should be put in the field, and others should be added from year to year until the benefactions of this work are felt not only by every doctor but at every hearthstone in this great country—that is, until the profession is really organized."

Respectfully submitted.

C. W. MILLER.

Mr. President, I also submit the following address by Dr. Munk at the meeting of the National Eclectic Association in June, 1911:

We, as eclectics, are a separate and independent school of medicine, but we are not the only one. It is as necessary and beneficial to have a variety of schools of medicine as it is to have parties in politics or sects in religion. Each school, party, or sect permits the citizen to have a choice, to select what he wants, and gives him the opportunity to act with those of his own way of thinking. This is his constitutional right under our system of free government of which we are all so proud. Attempts have been made to invade and annul this inalienable right. The same spirit of monopoly which pervades the commercial world is also found in medicine. To establish one school of medicine to the exclusion of all others would create State medicine, which is just as obnoxious and dangerous as is State religion. A variety of schools, parties, or sects is an advantage, as it causes a friendly rivalry by each one striving to excel the other, and a healthy competition that benefits the majority, which is as it should be, especially in a Government like ours, where majorities rule. This coveted power has been sought after for many years by the political ring in the American Medical Association, which it hopes to obtain eventually through State and national legislation.

All of the minor schools of medicine, known as the Allies, are opposed to such action, on the ground that it is class legislation and unconstitutional; but neither one of the Allies is strong enough to engage the enemy single handed. It also does not seem to be convenient for them to unite their several interests in one counter organization. In this crisis a new and welcome friend has appeared upon the scene to lend a helping hand. The National League for Medical Freedom was organized one short year ago as a lay movement in opposition to the offensive activity of the American Medical Association to force the Owen bill through Congress and establish a public bureau of health. Owing to the league's timely and energetic protest the bill failed to pass, but it is up again in a modified, but no less objectionable form, to be acted on during the present extra session of Congress. That the bill will be again defeated goes without saying, now that the people have been warned of their danger. If such a bill ever becomes law it will be a serious menace to liberty and freedom in the United States and will be the entering wedge for other objectionable and harmful legislation of a like character.

The scope of the league is nation wide and has branch offices in nearly every large city of the Union. Its function is to expose and oppose the evil designs of the Medical Trust in its endeavors to fasten itself upon the States and Nation; to give publicity to every point of interest and teach the people the right and wrong of everything that pertains to the subject. It is pledged to oppose every attempt to legislate against the interests of the people or to rob the citizen of his liberty and right to choose his own medical advisor. The objects of the league meet exactly our wants, and it behooves us to "pool our issues" and "hitch our wagon to a star" that will carry us safely and surely on to victory.

J. A. MUNK.

Also, resolutions passed at the thirty-second meeting of the International Hahnemann Association, at Asbury Park, N. J., June 23, 1911, as follows:

Whereas there is a persistent effort upon the part of the American Medical Association to establish a national department of health and thereby to infringe upon the liberties of the people in the free choice of a medical adviser and of the school of medicine by which they shall be treated; and

Whereas there now exist several schools of medical practice, well patronized by the people of the United States, none of which is to be recognized by the projected department of health; and

Whereas several of the large insurance companies have taken upon themselves to give medical advice to their policy holders and thus to further the policy of state medicine and the selfish and unpatriotic aims of the dominant school of medicine: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the International Hahnemann Association in session assembled does hereby utterly condemn and protest against the passage of Senate bill No. 1, known as the Owen bill, and House bill No. 11035, known as the Dyer bill, and all bills of similar import; and be it further

Resolved, That the International Hahnemann Association resents the impudent meddling on the part of commercial insurance companies with the medical treatment of private individuals and the practice of the family physician.

J. B. S. KING, Secretary.

HOW THE POWER OF THE DOCTORS IS EXERCISED.

I come now to a very brief consideration of the manner in which the power that is obtained by the American Medical Association by means of legislation of this kind in the States is exercised and the way in which it is received by the people who are cognizant of its exercise by that authority. I call attention first to a very brief article appearing in the Chicago (Ill.) Journal, as follows:

VACCINATION IS ENFORCED—PITTSBURG CHILDREN MUST SHOW MARKS OR SUBMIT TO INOCULATION IN PITTSBURG CAMPAIGN.

PITTSBURG, January 12.

The bureau of health of Pittsburg has ordered the immediate vaccination of all school children who can not prove by official demonstration that they have been vaccinated. Health Supt. E. L. Walter has discovered that many of the vaccination certificates furnished by pupils have been "faked," and he has instructed his assistants to accept neither assertion nor certificates unless vaccination marks can be shown. At least 200 children are now being vaccinated daily, and the doctors, working in squads of six, are going through each school from cellar to garret.

I also read very briefly from an article in the New York Press of March 28:

NEWARK, March 27.

There were further protests to-day by physicians and citizens against the order of Dr. George J. Holmes, chief medical inspector of the board of health, directing his assistants in examining school pupils to make all the children undress to the waist. The first protests came from

parents who refused to let their children be subjected to such examination. Particular objection was made to the method in which the examinations have been conducted. Girls from 10 to 14 years old have been taken in groups from classrooms and compelled to remove their clothing in one another's presence. This has met with opposition from many of the pupils.

I also submit a communication in the Milwaukee Free Press, as follows:

LETTERS TO THE FREE PRESS—PROTESTS AGAINST SCHOOL-INSPECTION BILL.

MILWAUKEE, April 29.

To the Editor:

On April 14 the assembly voted indefinitely to postpone action on the so-called school-inspection (doctor's) bill. This was the result of the vigorous protest set up by members of our league, who gave the joint committee of the senate and assembly facts that could end the matter in no other way.

This class of legislation (the most paternalistic) was supposed to be dead; but now I am informed that representatives of the American Medical Association and a local medical society branch have drawn another bill and sent it to the doctors who are members of the legislature.

This bill is also a compulsion measure, although it is written in a way intended to pull the wool over the eyes of the opponents of this kind of law.

When the bill is up for hearing or a vote every county in Wisconsin will be heard from against it.

Any bill, no matter what the wording, which adds to the authority of the so-called Medical Trust over the liberties of the people of Wisconsin will meet with vigorous opposition of this league, which is organized in every county of the State.

As long as doctors are in politics, just so long will this league exist. The doctors' organization has a membership of \$2,000. The league's strength is 200,000, a large share of which is contributing funds to pay the campaign expenses. Thus you have the two forces—the first named old and seasoned and with professional interest involved, while the latter is but a year old, with personal and to some extent religious liberty behind it.

The political doctors sometimes argue that their intentions are purely philanthropic. Let us look at Chicago. In 1908 the Cook County Medical Society offered, and the city accepted, a plan for the inspection—almost free—of public-school children. The Chicago newspapers fell into the trap and boosted it along. A few days after the first inspection was only partly made, these newspapers spread the result all over their first pages, announcing that "60,000 school children require medical attendance." Nearly all of these boys and girls were sent home, often to distracted parents, with letters detailing the awful diseases that the youngsters had. You can guess how many of the 60,000 were hurried to a doctor's office! Some were operated upon for adenoids, at all the way from \$10 to \$75 per operation; others were fitted with spectacles, and others were given prescriptions.

Is there any doubt about the sordid high finance end of this thing? Or in sounding these frequent alarms about disease are the alarmists "zealously working," as Henry M. Hyde says in the Saturday Evening Post, "to the destruction of the prospects of their own business"?

In the Chicago case it looks as if the "political doctors" sounded an alarm that resulted in a shower of prescriptions, medical calls, operations—business.

Medical practice, generally speaking (excepting always a great many physicians who are in a high, proud class by themselves), is firmly established by the American Medical Association on a commercial basis with a department devoted to alarms with which the magazines and newspapers are being victimized because most of the editors are not giving the subject the thought it deserves, and are publishing the alarms and creating the business for the political doctors, who of all men have and express the greatest aversion for the press—this latter being a part of the ethics of so-called "regular" practice—except in times when an "alarm" is necessary, and then it must be sounded by the press "free gratis for nothing." To advertise is one of the wickedest and most unforgivable things a "regular" (allopath) can do, but there is no rule in any medical association that I know of which prevents a member from sending a "personal" to a city editor announcing that he—the doctor—is going out of town on a vacation, so his patients will understand that he hasn't quit business.

Every good citizen has the welfare of the school children at heart, and the interest shown by the political doctors is all right until we dig around and find out what is back of it.

NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR MEDICAL FREEDOM.

WILLIAM F. HOOKER,

Secretary Wisconsin Division.

WHAT THE DOCTORS SAY ABOUT IT.

Now, Mr. President, I desire to call attention to some of the things that have been said by doctors themselves with respect to this matter, not only in regard to the character of the efforts that are being made, but what they expect to accomplish by the efforts that they are making to secure the passage of this bill.

One of the prominent members of the American Medical Association, Prof. G. Frank Lydston, M. D., of the faculty of the medical department of the University of Illinois, in an address before the Ohio Valley Medical Association, November 10, 1909, said:

Under the present political régime the American Medical Association has developed into a medicopolitical and commercial trust, which is the direct antithesis of what the machine which runs it promised it should be.

Dr. Welch, president of the American Medical Association, said to Senator Smoot:

I would simply like to throw out the suggestion that it may be that the Federal Government can exercise larger powers in this matter than is generally supposed to be the case.

Dr. Henry O. Marcy, former president of the American Medical Association, in an interview in the Boston Traveler on May 16, said of the opposition to the Owen bill:

It is the old cry of the incompetents who practice under various designations against legislation that will tend to bar them from practice

and keep the practice in the hands of those who will not be a menace to the public health.

There is the secret, Mr. President, of the effort that is being made in this direction. It is to bar those who are not supposed to have the necessary qualifications from the point of view of the American Medical Association from practicing the art of healing in any way whatever.

Dr. C. A. L. Reed, chairman of the legislative committee of the American Medical Association, says:

The principle that is involved is the same—that the man in possession of the technical knowledge which gives him a scientific comprehension of his subject and his problem * * * should have the executive authority to enforce that knowledge and not be overridden by a man who has no such technical knowledge, and consequently no such comprehension of the importance of the subject.

Now, see what it leads to, Mr. President. Who is going to determine who has the technical knowledge to deal with these questions if not the head of the department that is expected to be provided under this bill? Whatever his decree may be with respect to it, that will determine the qualifications of anybody connected with the administration of the public health. There is no way whatever provided for in this bill, or in any other way that I am aware of, that his judgment in that matter could be controlled in any way.

Prof. J. Pease Norton, of Yale University, in a speech before the American Association for the Advancement of Science, reprinted with approval in the Journal of the American Medical Association, said:

1. It seems desirable that a United States national department of health should be established, having as its head a secretary who shall be a member of the Executive Cabinet.

2. The purpose of the department should be to take all measures calculated, in the judgment of experts, to decrease deaths, to decrease sickness, and to increase physical and mental efficiency of citizens.

3. It should consist of the following bureaus:

- National bureau of infant hygiene.
- National bureau of education and schools.
- National bureau of sanitation.
- National bureau of pure food.
- National bureau of registration of physicians and surgeons.
- National bureau of registration of drugs, druggists, and drug manufacturers.
- National bureau of registration of institutions of public and private relief, correction, detention, and residence.
- National bureau of organic diseases.
- National bureau of quarantine.
- National bureau of health information.
- National bureau of immigration.
- National bureau of labor conditions.
- National bureau of research, requiring statistics.
- National bureau of research, requiring laboratories and equipment.

That simply shows the extent to which they propose to go if they succeed in establishing a department of health, and to my mind is quite significant.

THE FALSITY OF THE ARTICLES IN COLLIER'S WEEKLY.

Mr. President, I come now to the question of the truth or falsity of the articles contained in Collier's Weekly. I am not going to take up the time of the Senate in reviewing those articles. I have here certain very brief affidavits and also correspondence between the editor of Collier's Weekly and the officers of the League for Medical Freedom which will explain themselves and I think will clearly show that the articles contained in Collier's were not only false, but that they were knowingly so, and that they were malicious in their character.

They are as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK, County of New York, ss:

Benjamin O. Flower, being first duly sworn, deposes and says that he is of lawful age and a resident of Boston, Suffolk County, Mass.; that he is the editor of the Twentieth Century Magazine, in said city of Boston, and is the president of the National League for Medical Freedom, the principal offices of which and headquarters are in New York City; that he is acquainted with the officers and directors of said league, and that their occupations are as follows:

That William R. Brown, the first vice president, of Indianapolis, Ind., is a director of the Brown-Ketchum Iron Works, of said city, and is also president of the Willett Press, of New York City.

Hon. Charles W. Miller, of Waverly, Iowa, who is the second vice president of said league, is the publisher of the Waverly Democrat, in said city of Waverly, and a member of the Legislature of the State of Iowa.

That Paul A. Harsch, of said league, is the president of the Clinton Close Co. and secretary of the E. H. Close Realty Co., both of Toledo, Ohio.

That the Astor Trust Co., treasurer of said league, is a well-known financial institution of New York City.

That Hon. John L. Bates, the general counsel for said league, was formerly governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and is now an attorney in active practice in Boston.

That Col. Frederick A. Bangs, the associate counsel of said league, is an attorney in active practice in the city of Chicago, Ill., with offices in the First National Bank Building.

That the directors of said league are nine in number, and are as follows: Benjamin O. Flower, Frederick A. Bangs, William R. Brown, Harry E. Lesan, Charles W. Miller, Diana Belais, Harry Linden Chiles, Howard P. Crutcher, and Paul A. Harsch.

That of said directors not hereinabove mentioned as officers, said Lesan is the head of the H. E. Lesan Advertising Agency, of the city of New York, which said agency, among other things, handles the advertising of the New York Central lines and the United States Motor Co.

That Mrs. Diana Belais is the President of the Antivivisection Society of New York.

That Harry L. Chiles, of Orange, N. J., is an osteopathic physician in good and regular standing and active practice in said city, and he is also the secretary of the American Osteopathic Association.

That Dr. Howard P. Crutcher, of Kansas City, Mo., is a homeopathic physician in good and regular standing and in active practice in the city of Kansas City, and is registrar of the Hahnemannian Medical Institute.

Affiant further states that the affairs and business of said National League for Medical Freedom are conducted and transacted by said officers and directors and their employees, and by none other.

Affiant further states that the membership of said league is upward of 135,000; that it is manifestly impossible for affiant to be cognizant of the business activities of so large a number, but that to the best of his knowledge and belief none of said members are manufacturers of fraudulent remedies, or of any remedies.

And affiant further declares no manufacturers of fraudulent remedies or other remedies have been solicited or requested to become members of said league or to contribute to its support by any of the officers thereof.

Affiant further states that but one contribution to the funds of said league has been received from a person known to be the manufacturer of a remedy, and that said contribution was declined with thanks and returned to the donor.

And further deponent saith not.

BENJAMIN O. FLOWER.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this — day of November, 1910.

STATE OF NEW YORK, County of New York, ss.

Paul Arthur Harsch, being first duly sworn, deposes and says that he is the secretary of the National League for Medical Freedom; is in charge of its office and has the general conduct of its business; that he receives all remittances and contributions to the funds of said league, keeps proper books of account, and makes all deposits of receipts with the treasurer.

That, to the best of his knowledge and belief, none of the contributions to the funds of said league are from manufacturers of fraudulent remedies or of any remedies.

That no such manufacturers have ever been solicited to become members of said league or to contribute to its support by any of the officers thereof, and that the only contribution received from such a manufacturer was of the sum of \$100, and was by this affiant returned to the donor with the thanks of the league.

Affiant further states that he has read the above and foregoing affidavit, signed by Benjamin O. Flower, that he is familiar with the facts therein set forth, and that the same are substantially true.

And further deponent saith not.

PAUL A. HARSCH.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 12th day of November, 1910.

JAMES R. WRIGHT.

Notary Public, New York County.

STATE OF NEW YORK, County of New York, ss.

Joseph R. Kathrens, being first duly sworn, upon oath deposes and says that he is acting secretary of the National League for Medical Freedom, of New York City. That, in conjunction with B. O. Flower and William D. Brown, he has been actively engaged in the formation of said league. That he knows the source of all subscriptions and incomes of this league, and declares upon his oath that no subscription or fund of any kind or character has been solicited or received by this league or by him from any individual, firm, or corporation in any manner engaged in the manufacture or sale of medicines or drugs, or from any association composed of individuals, firms, or corporations engaged in the making or selling of drugs or medicines.

In witness whereof he has hereunto set his hand and seal this 18th day of May, A. D. 1910.

JOS. R. KATHRENS.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 18th day of May, A. D. 1910.

CHARLES ALVIN ROGERS,

Notary Public in and for the County of New York.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, June 28, 1911.

Mr. ALBERT LEE,

Managing Editor of Collier's, New York City.

MY DEAR MR. LEE: Your office kindly sends me an Extracts Bulletin of June 3, for what reason I know not, unless you desire me to take some notice of the leading article. Because of the article's reference to previous squibs, I have also looked them up.

It seems to me that I have rarely read articles which more clearly ignored fundamentals and indulged in mere bickerings and small animosities than these. The animus of the writer is plain in his first sentence: "The League of Medical Freedom is a bunch we don't like." Then he proceeds to dislike them, and that is about all.

You attack B. O. Flower, but chiefly through R. C. Flower. B. O. Flower may have been president of a patent-medicine company, or he may not. I don't know. But B. O. Flower has a career as a public-spirited editor, fearless editor, and advanced publicist too long for Norman Hapgood to discredit or to require me to defend it. He is not one of the late comers in the fight against plutocracy, privilege, and all the corrupting influences which threaten our social and political system as Collier's is. I do not recall the date of your conversion to real democracy, but I know it has never been strong enough to keep you from supporting the tools of plutocracy, and I believe that B. O. Flower was an honored veteran in the fight against the very abuses which you now decry when Collier's was a mere book agent's journal.

Mrs. Belais you call a "well-meaning, ignorant, reckless, and muddle-headed agitator." Well, well, that sounds surprisingly like the descriptions which the "standpat" and pro-Baillinger journals were wont to make of Collier's. Not an argument in it; just a denunciation. You find fault because she is "president of an antiexperiment society" (without naming the society). Probably the lady is a member of some society which objected to the well-authenticated case (for example) of the eminent Philadelphia physicians who indulged in the pleasing experiments of inoculating the eyes of orphan children with tuberculosis, etc., just to see what would happen. Is Collier's a proexperimentalist in a case like that?

Collier's manages to work itself into a spasm of horror over anyone who hints that patent medicines may not be much worse than other medicines. Personally, I don't believe in patent medicines (as the term is generally understood), but is it very much worse to defend a patent medicine than to sneer at a woman who disbelieves in the wanton torture of animals and of defenseless children? Even is it very much worse to believe in a patent medicine which has its formula printed on the label, as some have, than to believe in a physician's prescription, being entirely ignorant of its contents, as most patients are? Is it?

I have no doubt that there are members of the league who are in it for ulterior purposes. That is true of any organization, but that is not the question. The question is, What is the league really trying to do, and doing?

You don't get down to the question at all, except in some ranting assertions. You sneer at Flower as the author of the pamphlet on bubonic plague, but why don't you answer the argument contained in the pamphlet? You talk about a "notorious Colorado quack," but who is the man and why is he a "quack"? You reach the limit of absurdity when you attribute an increase in the Chicago death rate in 1910 over that of 1908 to the "large membership of the league" in Chicago.

Really, Mr. Lee, you and Norm Hapgood and the rest of the bright bunch on Collier's ought not to allow such a fool statement to appear. It reflects so severely upon your known intelligence that one can not discuss it with patience. The league is strong in Cleveland, too, and just at present the death rate is less than 10 per 1,000. Is that due to the league? Not unless one argues as Collier's is arguing, which Heaven forbid!

You accuse the league of "gopher methods." Another sneer which means nothing. Your statements are prejudiced and intended to prejudice others. They are not fair, they are not honest. Collier's has published several editorials against the league and you say you have received many protests. Have you published any of the arguments of the protests? I haven't seen any. Suppose, then, some member of the league should refer to your methods as "pole-cat methods," because you stir up such a stench to bedevil the issue. That wouldn't be polite, would it? And I wouldn't make such a reference to a magazine which I like (as a rule) as well as I do Collier's. Nor would I to any other. I am merely showing you how cheap your methods are, and how unpleasant they would be, were one to retaliate in kind. What are the "gopher methods" of the league? As far as I know, they have been singularly open. They have relied upon the "right of petition" and the weight of argument to defeat the establishment of a national board of health (?). When accused of being a "patent-medicine organization," they offered to disclose the list of contributors to their treasury to a properly authorized committee. Have you heard of any such offer by the league's opponents? Yet Collier's goes right on intimating that it is controlled by patent medicine interests.

But why not cease your bickering and get down to fundamentals? If you really think the league is a menace, why not state your real, and vital, objections to it and devote a certain space to the subject, pro and con? There would be something about an attitude like that which one could respect.

What is the fundamental item at issue? The league disbelieves in the establishment of State medicine, under the guise of a department of health, or a bureau of health.

Why does it so disbelieve? For reasons which ought certainly to appeal to Collier's. We have too much departmental rule in our Government now. Didn't you have enough of an experience of the corrupt strength of departmental government in the Ballinger case? You know it was only by a fortunate fluke that Ballinger was prevented from Morganheiling Alaska. Why? Because he was a departmental head and could interpret and execute laws both at the same time. The Post Office Department is another instance. Beneficent as it usually is, the Post Office Department abrogates the Constitution of the United States, and does it with impunity, and there is no appeal to any court which can prevent it. You know this, don't you? Departmental law and departmental justice are apt to be amenable to nothing except public opinion, and most of the time that isn't working, as you know.

Now, suppose you establish a department of medicine (no matter whether you call it a department or health or what), how long do you suppose it would be before the rights of all schools differing from it would be infringed? Just about long enough to get it into working order. Would the American Medical Association be satisfied to have a department of medicine, or health, and allow a Christian Scientist, say, to be at the head of it? They would not. Neither would you; neither would I.

Would Collier's be satisfied to have a department of health and have B. O. Flower at the head of it? You would not. Neither would the American Medical Association. Why? Why, because you don't want a department of health. You want a department of medicine.

I am in favor of health legislation—when it is health legislation. I am in favor of pure-food laws, and I venture to say I would go further than Collier's in defining what "pure food" really is. For example, I do not consider cold-storage corpses, hog-fat shortened bakery goods, or insect-colored bottled fruits (all of which now exist, unlabeled) as pure foods.

I am in favor of sanitation—public and private—and I do not consider it sanitary to put diseased pus into healthy veins "to prevent disease." Collier's evidently does.

I believe in the preservation of the purity of our water supplies, and I decry the fatuousness of our present medicated sanitarians, who make no objections to the pollution of our water supplies by sewage, but want to purify it afterwards by filtering or chemicalizing.

I believe in health, in hygiene, and in humaneness, and in making medical laws I want all three to be considered.

I believe we should attain to pure-food conditions, sanitation, hygiene, health through separate enactments, so that our rights may be safeguarded in each case. (The initiative and referendum will help the safeguarding.) I do not believe we should deliver ourselves into the hands of a department of medicine as a salvation from our physical ills.

I have nothing against "regular physicians," except when they attempt to arrogate to themselves all medical wisdom and authority. Some of my best friends and my family physician are "regular" doctors. At the same time I reserve the right to consult an osteopath, homeopath, hydropath, or any other "path" or "nonpath." In other words, I believe in that freedom which Collier's decries, and I believe the great majority of the members of the National League for Medical Freedom are of like mind. I do not mean that they all believe as I do, except that they believe in letting the other fellow believe as he does, and they deny the right of a department to destroy that freedom.

Collier's may have better reasons than thus far given, but in this instance I can not but feel it has made a sorry spectacle of itself in its fight against freedom.

Sincerely, yours,

EDMUND VANCE COOKE,
30 Mayfield Road.

MAY 15.

Mr. NORMAN HAPGOOD,

Editor Collier's Weekly, New York City, N. Y.

DEAR MR. HAPGOOD: I received in Pittsburg your letter of May 11 asking for certain information concerning the National League for Medical Freedom, and promptly wired you that the information requested would be furnished as soon as the data could be gotten together, and that on my return to New York I would give you every facility for further investigation.

If you are going into the subject as thoroughly as you say you are—and as thoroughly as I hope you will—let as many as possible of your important questions and our answers be put in writing. Ask all the questions you want—verbally or otherwise—we will answer them frankly; but to avoid misunderstanding and the possibility of being misquoted, let us make written communications the foundation for anything you print.

About the "half dozen men who met at a New York hotel," the editor of the Digest says "they met one day." In reality they met on several different days and at several different times and places.

The persons who attended these conferences—the founders of the National League for Medical Freedom—were those who are its present directors, and are as follows:

Mr. W. R. Brown, of Indianapolis, Ind.; Mr. B. O. Flower, of Boston, Mass.; Mr. Charles W. Miller, of Waverly, Iowa; Dr. Lewis Pinkerton Crutcher, of Kansas City, Mo.; Dr. Harry Linden Chiles, of East Orange, N. J.; Mrs. Diana Belais, of New York; Mr. Frederick A. Bangs, of Chicago, Ill.; Mr. Paul A. Harsch, of Toledo, Ohio; and myself.

The affiliations of these people are as follows:

Mr. W. R. Brown is vice president of the Brown-Ketcham Iron Works, of Indianapolis, Ind., and Greensburg, Pa. He is a Christian Scientist.

Mr. B. O. Flower is the editor of the Twentieth Century Magazine, of Boston, Mass. He was the founder of the Arena and was its editor for years. When sick he employs the services of an allopathic physician, but for 20 years has been opposing the efforts of the allopathic profession to establish a medical monopoly. Because of his writings in favor of medical freedom and his excellent reputation for integrity and patriotism the position of temporary president of the league was offered to him by a representative of Mr. W. R. Brown and myself, and he accepted the offer, to be later unanimously elected permanent president. Last week he was unanimously reelected president for his second term.

Mr. Charles W. Miller was invited to attend the New York conferences by Mr. Brown, Mr. Flower, and myself because of his vigorous opposition to medical arrogance in the Iowa Legislature, a subject which will be treated fully by Mr. Miller.

Dr. Lewis Pinkerton Crutcher is one of the most prominent physicians in the homeopathic profession. He is a member of the faculty of the Hahnemann Medical Institute in Kansas City, Mo., and has been for years warning homeopaths in speeches and writings against the aggression of the allopathic monopoly and opposing the trust and political methods of the American Medical Association. He was offered a directorship of the league and accepted it, and has been staunchly supported in the league by thousands of homeopathic practitioners and their patients.

Dr. Harry Linden Chiles is secretary of the National Osteopathic Association. He accepted a directorship, and is also being supported by thousands of osteopathic practitioners and their patients.

Mrs. Diana Belais was offered a directorship because of her courageous efforts to secure a higher law in New York State than the doctors' cruel theories and professional arrogance. She is president of the New York Antivivisection Society.

Mr. Frederick A. Bangs is an ex-president of the Hamilton Club, of Chicago. He is a prominent attorney and a Christian Scientist.

Mr. Paul A. Harsch is secretary of the E. H. Close Realty Co., of Toledo, Ohio, and removed to New York to become secretary of the league. He is a Christian Scientist.

I am a Christian Scientist.

These persons joined the work at different times, but all within a few weeks.

The only person who was acting in any prominent way at first who is not acting now is Joseph R. Kathrens, at present Chicago office manager of the Lesan Advertising Agency. He was a director and secretary-treasurer during the first few weeks while Mr. Harsch was arranging to remove to New York from Toledo. He represented me.

These people have run the league from its inception by meetings, the records of which you are at liberty to see if you desire.

They have collected all moneys received and disbursed by popular subscriptions among their own affiliations and from no place else.

The amount of money collected up to May 2, 1911, was \$94,274.39. The subscription books are open to you in detail for any investigation you want to make, and we will also be glad to tell you in detail what the money was spent for.

In the membership of approximately 200,000 at this time there are registered 7,500 individual subscriptions, ranging from 25 cents to \$10,000. Many of these sums, however, have been made up from smaller sums secured by the person sending in the larger sum. It is likely, therefore, that fully 20,000 persons have subscribed. Where a large sum has been sent us we can secure the names of the individuals subscribing the aggregate.

In the membership there are nearly 10,000 physicians of all schools, and at this time the membership of the league is growing faster among physicians than among any other class of people.

These members, including physicians, have joined this league and subscribed their money from one motive and one motive only; i. e., to stop the dominant efforts of the allopathic medical oligarchy to establish a system of State compulsory medicine in this country and to insure to themselves and to all other American citizens the right to employ the practitioner of his choice.

In regard to the questions you ask about Messrs. Flower, Miller, Carr, Englehart, and Huhn, I have forwarded a request to each one of them for the information desired, and will give it to you as soon as it is received.

I will say, however, that I know now that some of the statements your questions imply are true, and I know that others are not true.

MAY 22, 1911.

You misunderstood me about Mr. Flower. I said he was not now associated with his brother in the patent-medicine business, but did not say that he had not been so associated. I may even have been mistaken in this; Mr. Flower will answer that.

Even if all the things implied in your letter were admitted, I fail to see that anything has been established which in the least proves your sweeping statement that our membership is composed for the most part of people "hard hit by the pure food and drug act," or that we are "gophers," or that our money is secured from patent medicine and adulterated food sources, or that it is expended for anything even remotely connected with this subject.

In every movement in support of a principle there are likely to be found three elements which may be made the subject of criticism. First, those who join the movement for selfish purposes; second, those who join out of resentment toward those whom the movement opposes; and, third, those who may have at one time been associated with those whom you oppose, but have changed their views.

In a membership of 200,000 it would be foolish for us to say positively that not a single one of the first two types has slipped in, and any information of this kind you have will be gladly received. We welcome and defend those of the third type.

But we know who and what practically all of our 200,000 members are, and we know that they are in no way interested in the subject which you state that they are there to defend.

Nor can we say that not a dollar has ever been received from such a source as that you claim, but we know that not a dollar has been received from such a source known to any of the directors, and that money received from such sources has been returned, and help offered by these sources has been declined.

We also know that the method of securing the funds was such, and we are sufficiently familiar with the details of where this money came from to be able to prove that neither you nor any of your doctor friends can possibly be more antagonistic to the interests you claim we received it from, and for whose interests you claim we expended it, than are those who subscribed 99 per cent of the money for the league's support.

I hope this answers your letter of May 11 to the extent which it can be answered at this time. You say you will ask us a great many helpful questions. We shall be glad to have them as fast as you can prepare them, so that we can be working on the data, and would suggest personal conferences at any time, an investigation of the league books, a talk with our fiscal agent, the Astor Trust Co., or anything else that may be helpful to you, and then when that is all over we will ask you to go back to the original article which you published under the title of "A Bad Bunch," and go over it carefully with us and see what, if any, of the statements there made you have been able to prove or we have been able to disprove.

And then, of course, we will ask you to correct the wrong that you have done, and we feel sure that you will do so.

Sincerely,

THE NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR MEDICAL FREEDOM,
H. E. LESAN,
Chairman Committee on Publicity and Education.

COLLIER'S,
416 WEST THIRTEENTH STREET,
New York City, May 16, 1911.

DEAR MR. LESAN: On account of the condition on which you write the inclosed letter, which I have put in brackets on the first page, I think it only fair that I should return it to you.

In trying to find out what you definitely deny I had no intention of binding myself to cooperate with you in anything I may write in the future. I certainly shall not do that. I was merely trying to have the oral protest which you made the other day put in writing to avoid any possible misunderstanding.

Yours, very truly,

NORMAN HAPGOOD.

MAY 17, 1911.

Mr. NORMAN HAPGOOD,
Editor Collier's Weekly, New York City.

DEAR MR. HAPGOOD: Replying to your letter of May 16, in which you return my letter of the 15th written as a protest of the National League for Medical Freedom against certain untrue statements made in Collier's issue of May 6, under the caption "A bad bunch."

I have been unfortunate in expressing myself, or you have read something into my letter that was not there.

I certainly had no intention of endeavoring to bind you to cooperate with me in anything you might write in the future on this or any other subject.

My purpose was exactly as you say, and that was to have our protest put in writing, and to let all such written communications become the foundation of anything which you printed which purported to quote the National League for Medical Freedom.

Outside of what statements we make—for which we are entirely responsible—and such modifications of your ideas as such statements of ours may make, we are not endeavoring to influence what you say in Collier's, though, of course, we would hold you responsible for anything that you said that was not true, and especially so after we had given you the opportunity to learn the truth.

Therefore I am sending back to you my letter of May 15, with this note of explanation, and would like to hear from you in regard to it.

Sincerely, yours,

H. E. LESAN.

COLLIER'S, May 19, 1911.

DEAR MR. LESAN: Thanks for yours of the 18th, which was of much interest to me.

I heartily return your personal satisfaction regarding the opportunity to talk it over, and am sorry that no matter how clearly the facts may be agreed upon in the long run by us, our principles and beliefs must be widely divergent. What I wish to do, if possible, is to make clear my opinion of the work that Christian Science is doing in the world, while at the same time making clear my strong belief in the medical profession and in the harm that is done by organized opposition to that profession.

Yours, sincerely,

NORMAN HAPGOOD.

Mr. H. E. LESAN,
381 Fourth Avenue, New York City.

Mr. NORMAN HAPGOOD,
Collier's Weekly, New York City.

DEAR MR. HAPGOOD: I wrote you the last of the week that not later than Monday we would put certain information in your hands, as per your request.

We feel, however, that the situation, from our standpoint at least, has been somewhat changed by your communication of May 19.

If we understand your letter correctly, it means that when we have established that the things you said in Collier's about the league were untrue, that you then expect to justify your attack—or even to continue it—on the ground that an organization which protests against any of the methods of the so-called regular medical profession is inimical to the public welfare.

The directors of the league feel, in view of their frankness in placing all the information at your disposal—quite as much to save you embarrassment as to prove our own position—that they should not go any further in giving you an opportunity to learn the facts until they have some indication from you as to your intentions—

First, in regard to correcting false statements in Collier's of May 6. Second, as to your future intention toward the National League for Medical Freedom.

On receipt of satisfactory assurances that you mean to be fair in correcting the wrong done us on May 6, and that you will not use the information given you in confidence for the purpose of proving you are wrong in one set of statements, to support your attack from another direction, we will be glad to submit the information.

Without such assurances the directors feel that they should adopt some other course of setting themselves right before the public.

This is all said, however, without any intention of abridging your right to express your opinions as you choose, and with every confidence on the part of all of us that your intentions are perfectly fair in regard to statements of fact, and that you will so assure us.

Sincerely, yours,

H. E. LESAN.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 16, 1911.

PAUL A. HARSCH,
Secretary National League for Medical Freedom,
New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR SIR: Referring to your letter of yesterday, in which you ask enlightenment as to questions propounded by Mr. Hapgood, of Collier's, is at hand. I will answer the questions in the order they are given:

"1. Did Mr. C. W. Miller, as a representative of the Legislature of Iowa, oppose the passage of the pure-food law in that State?"

Neither as a representative of the legislature or as a newspaper writer did I oppose the law in question. As a matter of fact the Iowa pure-food law was passed by the thirty-first general assembly whereas my legislative service did not begin until the thirty-second.

"2. Did he make a charge, decided to be false in court, that the Bremer County Medical Society had a fee schedule?"

With reference to this matter, I beg to state that there was never any denial of the fact that the Bremer County Medical Society had a fee schedule. The Bremer County Medical Society, in addition to its extortionate fee schedule, had a blacklist agreement under the terms of which any family in arrears to one member of the society and listed as poor pay by him would be refused attendance by any other member thereof save on a cash-in-advance basis or upon the order of the county commissioners or township trustees.

Because these agreements appeared to be in violation of the Iowa antitrust law the grand jury of my county found indictments against the physicians party thereto. I was summoned as a witness before the grand jury making these indictments, before whom I produced and gave into its hand an original copy of the fee schedule which had been printed for the guidance of the physician subscribing to it. The case never came to a formal trial, but all of the issues involved were thrashed out in a habeas corpus proceeding. The decision of the district court, subsequently confirmed by the supreme court, was that medical service was labor rather than a commodity, and that since the indicted physicians had but resorted to the ordinary devices of labor unions, they were without guilt in the eyes of the law. All of these various matters are referred to in some detail in the articles I contributed in the national magazines two years ago. Since I believe you have a copy of their compilation in your hands, would suggest that you submit them to Mr. Hapgood's perusal. Having turned his attention to this subject, I am inclined to believe he would find much in them both of interest and enlightenment.

In conclusion let me state that if wrongly accusing the Bremer County Medical Society of adopting a fee schedule would justify my description as part of a "bad bunch," the inference seems plain that the odium should be lifted from me and attached elsewhere, providing my accusation is shown to have been a simple statement of undisputed fact. Certainly no complaint would be lodged against me by Mr. Hapgood for making even an unfounded statement regarding the practices of a medical society that were not to its discredit, and I take it that he looks upon the employment of trust and union labor methods to extort unreasonable fees from the sick and ailing in the same light that I do. He seems wholly unaware of the fact, however, that practically all of the country medical societies affiliated with the American Medical Association maintain fee schedules such as I complained of with reference to the Bremer County Medical Society. He should be advised of this fact, along with the further fact that the supreme body not only urges the adoption of fee schedules by local societies, but goes so far as to suggest the prices that should be printed in them. Conclusive evidence on these points is furnished by the Journal of American Medicine, the official mouthpiece of the American Medical Association, and I would refer Mr. Hapgood in particular to the article from that publication which I submitted as part of my statement to the House committee at the hearing on the health bills last year.

I am glad that Mr. Hapgood is looking us up, and if he will display the same diligence in looking up the organization that is resorting to all manner of falsehood and misrepresentation for the purpose of discrediting the opposition to its selfish ambition, as I believe he will, the result can not be other than gratifying.

I beg to remain, very sincerely,

C. W. MILLER.

ATTITUDE OF CHRISTIAN SCIENTISTS TOWARD PURE-FOOD AND SANITARY LAWS.

Mr. President, in this connection I think it is well for me to correct an impression that prevails, no doubt very generally,

in regard to the attitude of Christian Scientists toward pure-food laws, sanitation laws, and other laws of similar character. It is generally given out—and, I suppose, generally believed—that Christian Scientists are opposed to all such legislation, which is a very great mistake. They believe in all kinds of sanitation that is necessary and proper for the purpose of preserving health. We have not yet reached that stage when we can simply say we will ignore all material means of that kind for the purpose of bettering the condition of our people and that we can heal disease in some other way and without such precautions. Christian Scientists try to be reasonable with respect to such matters. While they may believe that theirs is a better way, that may sometime become the exclusive way of dealing with sickness and disease, yet they submit to such legislation as being proper and right under the circumstances. You never find any Christian Scientist undertaking to violate or to repudiate or to in any way interfere with the administration of such laws. I want to say now that there is no truth in this statement that this movement is in any way allied with the people who are opposing the pure-food laws. It has no such foundation. The people who are honestly and conscientiously opposing this legislation have no sympathy with the people who are opposing pure-food laws and other laws of a similar character.

DOCTORS' FEE BILLS.

Mr. President, there has been some indignant protest against the claim that is made that the American Medical Association is attempting to establish throughout this country fee bills to regulate the amount of charges that shall be made by doctors irrespective of their ability or competency to do the work which they are attempting to do. For the purpose of meeting that position and showing that we have not been unjust with respect to it, but that we are acting upon sufficient information, I desire to embody in my remarks an article that has been written by Dr. J. N. McCormack, to whom I have heretofore referred, with respect to this matter of fee bills, calling attention to the fact and urging that that sort of control should be established throughout the country. The reason why the American Medical Association has not declared for establishing fee bills within its own ranks is very apparent. They do not compose all of the doctors in any neighborhood or in any county or locality. Therefore, if they, as an organization, were to establish the fee bills and be regulated and bound by them, the other physicians of the neighborhood would not, and consequently they would be at a disadvantage.

But the man who speaks for them, the man who is in a sense their walking delegate, goes about the country and advocates the establishment of these fixed charges, and says, in that connection, that it would not do for a part of the physicians in any locality to establish fee bills, but that it should be done by all of them. Therefore he is using the power of the American Medical Association to bring into that organization not only the members of the association itself, but all the physicians in any given locality where they are willing to be bound by such regulations. That will be proved by the article of the doctor himself, who is quite frank on that subject. It is as follows:

MEDICAL ECONOMICS, BY DR. J. N. MCCORMACK.

[From the Journal of the American Medical Association.]

The county societies and postgraduate courses furnish the facilities for doing the scientific and social features of this work. For the business side of it I am advising that the profession in each county or city consider the advisability of arranging for systematic monthly collections with a carefully selected business representative and a centrally located "medical collector's office," the collector to be under bond and on a definite salary, and with authority to appoint as many assistants as may be necessary, for whom he is responsible, very much as sheriffs and city collectors do.

The collector should be a man of tact and judgment; he should hold the affairs of each physician as strictly private and confidential, and he should be well paid.

For obvious reasons the schedule should be adopted by the profession as a whole or as individuals and not by the county society. The provision in the by-laws forbidding such action by the societies, inserted after careful consideration, was certainly wise under the conditions then and still existing, and probably should be permanently retained.

The membership in most societies embrace only about from one-half to three-fourths of the physicians of the county. While it is probable that all, including the former sectarians, will finally come in, this will be the work of years, and, although not absolutely essential, it is important that the schedule be agreed to practically by all the active physicians of the jurisdiction, whether members or not.

The rates should not be too hard and fixed. There are people of moderate circumstances in almost every community—factory operatives and others—who ought to pay something, and yet should not pay full fee, and a wise discretion on this and similar points must be provided for in any plan which is to be comprehensive and successful. The orders for arrangement and the items of practice included are as seems best suited for most counties and communities, but the purpose is to make it so simple and flexible that it can be altered to suit varying conditions and views. For instance, if it is thought best, fees for fractures and dislocations or any other surgical or special work can be easily added. It will be noted that a broad distinction is made between ordinary and complete office examinations, including a thorough exami-

nation of the chest, urinalysis, and other like work involving extra time and skill. My own opinion is that a double charge should be made for night practice for well-to-do people, but I have yielded to the views of others on this point. Telephone practice is so annoying, exacting, and unsatisfactory that it certainly should be paid for, except where regular visits are being made, and in all cases after bedtime. Consultations are purposely made low in order to develop and encourage this variety of practice.

The form of schedule suggested and the footnote as they should go on the placard are as follows:

Schedule of medical fees for ——— County.

| | |
|---|--------|
| Day visit in town | \$2.00 |
| Night visit in town | 3.00 |
| Day visit in country, first mile, \$2; each after mile, one way | 1.00 |
| Night visit in country, first mile, \$3; each after mile, one way | 1.50 |
| Ordinary office examination and advice | 1.00 |
| Complete examination and advice | 5.00 |
| Advice or prescription by telephone | 1.00 |
| Obstetric case, uncomplicated, not over 6 hours | 15.00 |
| Life-insurance examinations | 5.00 |

Consultation, double ordinary visit.

Surgical and other special fees as may be arranged.

I have also, Mr. President, a letter here from B. O. Flower, president of the League for Medical Freedom, and a statement accompanying it showing the falsity of the articles in Collier's Weekly. They are as follows:

[Extracts from letter of Mr. Flower.]

BOSTON, MASS., June 28, 1911.

HON. JOHN D. WORKS,

United States Senate Chamber,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE: Mr. Hapgood's article is a tissue of misrepresentations, and misrepresentations that were knowingly made. For example, I wrote a letter to Mr. Lesan, which he forwarded to Hapgood, in which I stated that I had devoted my entire time to literary work from 1889; that I had not invested one dollar, directly or indirectly, in proprietary medicines or in any other business matters outside of the publication business; that my position in regard to proprietary medicines and the protection of the people from drugs and poisons had always been outspoken and on the side of genuine protection for the people. After one year of investigation, trying to find something in my record or history that he could use to discredit me, he so signally fails that he singles out a member of my family and seeks to discredit me through assailing that member, although I have never had a particle of business relations with that member since 1889 and that party has never been connected directly or indirectly with the National League for Medical Freedom. The dragging of the name in was done, of course, to try to discredit me. In the same way he has tried to discredit Mr. Miller by innuendoes and false implications. His attack on Mrs. Belais was one of the most shameful and insulting characterizations possible, aimed against a woman of remarkably clear mental vision, of strong moral convictions, high minded, and in every way worthy of esteem. Of our entire advisory board Hapgood is able to find three persons that he claims have been interested in or have defended proprietary medicines. Mr. Huhn is connected with a proprietary medicine concern, but in that concern there are over 2,000 members of the American Medical Association, the association that is pretending to be so desirous of driving out of business proprietary medicines.

I am taking the liberty of inclosing to you a detailed statement in regard to Collier's article, which I have prepared. This is sent to you because I thought you might like to have the data in case any questions should come up relating to points in this article. I have gone somewhat into the details in regard to what Hapgood stated about my connection with my brother's company—a connection which he knew ended in 1889, but which, in his paper, he stated extended to 1899, or about 10 years after the company had gone out of business. I have also gone into considerable detail in regard to other members of my own family and my own literary work, etc. All this is offensive and unpleasant to me. I had preferred not to mention anything about my family relations or my own work, but since Collier's has attacked me on account of one member of my family, I felt I was justified in referring to other members of the family who have held large and honorable positions on both sides of the water, and I have mentioned my own work simply for the purpose of giving to you the opportunity, if any attack was made upon me any time, to refer to what I had done. The other points in this communication, I think, you may find helpful to you.

Cordially, yours,

B. O. FLOWER.

STATEMENT OF LEAGUE FOR MEDICAL FREEDOM IN ANSWER TO ARTICLE IN COLLIER'S WEEKLY.

1. In the recent attack made by Collier's on the National League for Medical Freedom, thoughtful and intelligent readers can not fail to be impressed with the fact that this journal makes no attempt to meet the arguments or the position taken by the league and its representatives; no attempt to consider whether the position taken is sound, reasonable, and in accord with the spirit of democracy, the rightful freedom of the people, and the best interests of scientific advance. This journal starts out with the assumption that the ever-changing fads, theories, and dogmas of the so-called regular school of medicine are the infallible truths, and that those who question the right of these would-be, self-appointed censors of public health to secure compulsory medication and the enactment of legislation inimical to the rights of the citizen—legislation that would tend to prevent him from employing the practitioner of his choice or which would compel him to submit to treatments that he believes to be dangerous—are enemies to the public weal; that their motives should be impugned and their views misrepresented, and they should be made the victim of abusive epithets. Instead of a free, candid, fair discussion of the merits of the issues and arguments involved, such as would be worthy of honorable journalism, this publication chooses to attack individuals and substitute epithets and innuendoes for arguments. It is no new thing to find those who feel they can not meet arguments or successfully refute the position taken by an antagonist, to resort to mud slinging. This is precisely what Collier's has done, and, in this instance, the attempt is so pitifully weak that only by resorting to the subtleties of the pettifogger could it hope to throw dust in the eyes of even its most careless and superficial readers. Here we find misstatements of facts

and unwarranted inferences hand in hand with unjustifiable interpretations and insulting epithets, which the defenders of a bad cause so often rely on to enable them to ignore arguments and which they hope may so discredit the opposition that its reasons and arguments will not carry the weight that they merit. Let us examine the facts.

2. The editor of Collier's, before he penned his misleading article, had in his possession the facts that the president of the league had, since 1889, or for more than 20 years, devoted his entire time to editorial and literary work, and that during this time he had not invested one dollar in any proprietary medicine or drug concern whatsoever, nor had he received one dollar directly or indirectly from such source, and that no relative or friend, so far as he knew, had directly or indirectly any interest in any description in any proprietary medicine for sometime prior to the organization of the National League for Medical Freedom or since its organization. These facts were placed in the hands of the editor of Collier's so that he would not inadvertently make any false statements. Yet in the article in Collier's the statement is made that the president of the league was an officer in a medical company from 1885 to 1899. It is a fact, which the president of the league has never denied, that during the eighties of the last century he served for a time as secretary to a brother who enjoyed a large medical practice, numbering among his patients a great many persons of prominence, such as Col. Thomas A. Scott, Joseph Jefferson, the actor, and scores of other prominent persons, who testified to the fact that under his treatment they had received great benefits after failing to receive benefits from other physicians. During this period a company was organized to place on the market a few of the remedies that had seemed to be particularly effective in a great number of cases. At this time this brother also had a sanitarium in Boston with a staff of able medical assistants. One of these has since been a State examiner on the board of health in Massachusetts. In 1889 the president of the league severed all business connections with his brother and devoted his entire time to literary work, and he was not in any way connected with the business, directly or indirectly, after 1889, and not 1899, as stated by Collier's.

After a year's searching to find something against the president of the league that could be used in a mud-slinging campaign, the editor confesses his weakness by denouncing another member of the president's family, who never had any connection, directly or indirectly, with the league, and with whom the president of the league has had no business connections for more than a score of years. To try to discredit one man by attacking another member of his family may serve the purpose of such a sheet as Collier's, that prefers epithets to arguments, but it is not a method that will appeal to fair-minded or reason-governed persons.

If the editor had taken the trouble to investigate the family of the president, he would have found that if one of its members had been discredited in the public mind a great number of others had occupied positions of honor and enjoyed the love and respect of millions of people.

The eldest brother of the president was, to the time of his death, one of the leading pulpit orators and pastors in the Church of the Disciples, or Christian Church—the church to which President Garfield belonged. His father was, for more than 60 years, or to the time of his death at the age of 84, an honored and successful minister in the Disciple Church, being one of the pioneers in that denomination and the founder of scores of flourishing churches. A great-uncle of the president, Edward Fordham Flower, settled in Stratford-on-Avon, England. He was several times elected mayor of Stratford. One of his sons, Charles, was the chief promoter and contributor to the building of the famous Shakespearean Memorial Theater, of Stratford. Another brother, Edward, did more than any other person to restore historic Stratford, to preserve such historic buildings as the Ann Hathaway cottage, the birthplace of Shakespeare, etc. A third son was the celebrated English scientist, naturalist, and surgeon, Sir William H. Flower. He was the author of over 300 published works, one of Queen Victoria's surgeons, and, for many years prior to his death, head of the department of natural history of the British Museum. Sir William H. Flower was one of the principal contributors on natural-history subjects to the ninth edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica. It was Sarah Flower Adams, another of the president's ancestors, who penned the world-famous hymn, "Nearer, my God, to Thee." These are but a few relatives of the president of the league, who have justly won a commanding place in public affection and esteem because they have been servants of progress and civilization.

During the past 22 years the president of the league, besides being the editor of the Arena and later of the Twentieth Century Magazine, has written a number of important volumes, embracing historical works, social and economic studies, biographies, and literary criticisms. Most of these volumes have enjoyed large circulation in America, England, and Australasia, and at least one of the works has been translated into German and published in Berlin. Among his leading cloth-bound volumes are: *The Century of Sir Thomas More*, an historical survey of the first century of modern times; *How England Averted a Revolution of Force*, an historical study of the first 10 years of Queen Victoria's reign; *Civilization's Inferno*, or *Studies in the Social Cellar*; *The New Time*, a plea for the union of the moral forces for practical progress; *Whittier: Prophet, Poet, and Man*; *Gerald Massey: Poet, Prophet, and Mystic*; *Lessons Learned from Other Lives*, a book of short biographical sketches; and *Persons, Places, and Ideas*, a volume of literary and critical essays.

Here is a man who for 22 years has been in public life and has been under the full glare of publicity, aggressively battling for political, social, and economic justice, an editor and author of distinction, a man loved best by those who know him best, and universally respected by those who are acquainted with his life, a man who, as the editor of Collier's knew before he wrote his article, had devoted the past 22 years of his life entirely to literary work and the furtherance of fundamental democracy and economic advancement, and during this time had not invested one dollar in proprietary medicines or received a dollar from any proprietary or drug interest, and that he had not only not advocated or defended proprietary medicines, but had advocated legislation, as will be presently shown, that would compel every manufacturer of proprietary medicines to clearly label the exact contents of his remedies; and this person is cited by Collier's as a leading officer of the league to prove that the league is interested in and supported by the proprietary-medicine interests. After months' or a year's investigation Collier's find it necessary to seek to discredit the president by attacking a relative with whom the president has had no business connections for more than a score of years. But this is not all.

The editor of Collier's evidently felt it necessary to convey the idea that this man, who he knows had not for more than a score of years invested a dollar in any proprietary medicine or drug interest or received a dollar from any such interest, and who has no relations or friends engaged in this business, was a defender of patent medicines,

else his claim would be so palpably absurd as to render his journal ridiculous in the eyes of thinking people. So what does he do? He searches to find out some line in the president's writings that might be construed as in advocacy of proprietary medicines. He could not have failed to find that here, as elsewhere, the president had been outspoken and fearless in the expression of his opinions, but he must also have seen that his demands and suggestions for safeguarding the people's rights were the very thing that the proprietary medicine interests would most strongly oppose if the medicines were, as the editor of Collier's would have the people believe, composed of dangerous poisons or habit-forming drugs or otherwise worthless compositions. Instead of daring to copy any comprehensive statement of Mr. Flower on the subject of proprietary medicines, because he knew it would utterly discredit and disprove Collier's claims, this editor resorts to one of the most contemptible methods of misrepresentation that a sensational journalist can stoop to. He takes one sentence apart from the context and dismisses it as if it was one of many statements favorable to proprietary medicine interests. Thus, he says: "His views on patent medicines are often expressed. For instance: 'I think that a great majority of proprietary medicines are infinitely less dangerous to the public than the majority of regular doctors' prescriptions.'" In passing it may be observed that Mr. Flower stands firmly on this position, holding that the great majority of proprietary medicines have been simple remedies that, in the hands of successful family physicians, have seemed to work cures, and that the great majority of men who to-day are under the influence of opium, chloral, cocaine, and other habit-forming drugs have been brought to their present condition through physicians' prescriptions, and that the great majority of dangerous medicines administered to the people have been and are being given by the regular profession.

The editor of Collier's spoke truly when he said the president's "views are often expressed," but he did not dare to give the public those well-known views, simply because to do so would expose his own insincerity. For the benefit of the public, and to show how thoroughly Collier's statement misrepresents the president's position on this question, we give below his unequivocal views in regard to patent medicines and the rights of the people as published nearly a year ago, that the readers may judge for themselves:

"DRUG CONSUMPTION AND THE PUBLIC."

"Passing from the consideration of foods to that of drugs and medicines, we find ourselves in the presence of general charges, some of them not worthy of special attention and others calling for serious consideration.

"It is claimed that the people of the United States annually spend many millions of dollars for patent or proprietary medicines, and some of our medical brethren have pointed out that this amount of money is thus lost to the profession. They might even go much further and say that the amount paid by the people would probably be far greater if they were forced to depend upon the doctors instead of the family medicines, for a bottle of some simple or family medicine frequently prevents the family sending for a doctor for many common ailments and thus incurring a bill many times greater than the cost of several bottles of medicines.

"We hold no brief for the proprietary-medicine manufacturers, and would heartily favor any legislation that would compel full publicity as to the nature and composition of the various medicines so popular with the people, provided the same measure of wholesome publicity be extended to the doctors' prescriptions, for we believe the people have a right to know what they take and that no class of vendors or prescribers of foods or medicines should be immune.

"It is true that not a few of the old and popular proprietary remedies were originally favorite prescriptions of family physicians enjoying large practices. The medicines that were later put on the market had seemed to be peculiarly efficacious, and the doctor or some druggist subsequently began their manufacture and sale to the public. In recent years, since the craze for getting rich has become a national mania, a number of new preparations, some of them said to contain small quantities of opium, chloral, cocaine, and other habit-forming drugs, have been put on the market, and the charge is made that in certain instances the drugs contained in these medicines might easily lead to death through carelessness of the consumer, or in other instances there is grave danger of brain and nerve destroying habits following the use of the medicines. The first charge is far less serious than the second. As a matter of fact, few manufacturers of proprietary medicines would dare to take any risk with the careless general purchaser of drugs by putting large quantities of any deadly poison in his preparations, even if such drugs were not too expensive to be used in such preparations.

"The charge that there are medicines on the market containing sufficient opium in some form, or cocaine or chloral, to lead to drug habits on the part of innocent victims deserves serious consideration, for in our age of stress, business excitement, rush, and worry a large proportion of our people have little reserve or resisting power, and stimulents and habit-forming drugs soon play havoc with their victims. We hold that under no circumstances whatever should any habit-forming drug be dispensed without the consumer's full knowledge as to what he is taking, and if such drugs are to be dispensed in any way that there should be legal requirements compelling every manufacturer of any preparation containing any poison or habit-forming drug to put a red label on every bottle or package, on which should be printed in plain English the name of the drug and the amount of the same used in the preparation. This we believe to be a rightful protection that should be demanded, and a penalty should follow any attempt on the part of manufacturers to deceive the consumer by failure thus to warn him of the dangerous drugs contained in the preparations.

"IMPERATIVE NECESSITY OF PUBLICITY IN THE PRESCRIPTION OF ALL HABIT-FORMING DRUGS."

"But this protection does not go far enough. It entirely ignores the chief cause of the alarming increase in the drug habit among our people. We think it is quite safe to say that at least 90 per cent of the victims of opium, chloral, cocaine, and other brain and nerve-destroying drugs contract these habits through prescriptions given by regular doctors, and in a large number of cases the patients are entirely ignorant of the nature of the drug that is administered or of the fact that they are taking any habit-forming poison. When one thinks of the great army of victims of opium, chloral, and cocaine, whose lives have been wrecked and who are dragging out a living death, who were innocently introduced to these enslaving drugs by physicians, he realizes the imperative need for prompt legislation compelling every physician who prescribes these medicines to write the prescription in plain English, in red ink, as red, being the poison color, would help warn the patient of lurking danger in the prescription. This legal regulation would give the patient a needed protection. Then, if he desired to take the risk, he could do so, but it would give him the chance to escape what in thousands and tens of thousands of cases has proved a fatal curse

innocently contracted by the taking of medicines about the composition of which he was ignorant.

"Will the political doctors, who have been so loudly clamoring for the protection of the people from proprietary medicines supposed to contain minute proportions of some habit-forming drug, join us in demanding that the people be made acquainted with the presence of such drugs in all preparations and in all prescriptions which go into their hands?"

"That in the great majority of cases where persons have contracted the drug habit they first acquired a taste for the poison from doctors' prescriptions, will not, we imagine, be questioned. That the people have a right to know of their peril before running the risk of coming under the influence of opium and other subtle poisons is evident. Hence, if the solicitations of our medical brethren for protection of the 'dear people' are sincere, they certainly will unite in this demand to afford genuine protection without vicious class distinction. If they are honest in their pretensions and realize the magnitude of the curse, they will join in urging that the chief source of this evil, no less than minor sources, be brought under such legal provisions as will give the people at least protective knowledge. If, on the other hand, the political doctors are merely bent on building up a great nation-wide Medical Trust or monopoly, and are using this plea as the advocates of special legislation among the physicians in the various States have been wont to use similar pleas when seeking restrictive legislation, they will oppose this genuine attempt to protect the people. And we confess that we have small hope of the aid of the drug-dispensing political doctors in this important crusade, and one thing that makes us doubt is their action when an opportunity similar to the above was given them in the State of Iowa. There a measure was introduced providing for the use of red labels on certain proprietary medicines. The second vice president of the National League for Medical Freedom, Hon. Charles W. Miller, a member of the legislature, while approving the legislation provided it be made general and not class in character, and provided it be so shaped as to afford real protection for the people, amended the proposed bill by providing that physicians who dispensed opium, chloral, and similar drugs should write their prescriptions in plain English, in red ink. This simple and thoroughly proper amendment created consternation in the camp of the political doctors, and every effort was made to have the amendment stricken out. Failing in this, the bill was defeated.

"Clearly, if the protection of the people is the purpose of our lawmakers, and not the aggrandizement of a great privilege-seeking class, the laws enacted must be so comprehensive as to include in their scope the class chiefly responsible for the evils against which the citizen is to be warned, as in the case of habit-forming drugs.

"Nothing is more vicious than class legislation or legislation that gives special advantage to a class or classes. Indeed, now as never before is it vitally important to scrutinize all legislation proposed, to see if there is not behind it some great special interest seeking power or financial advantage as a result of the proposed laws or enactments. Never has there been a time when it was so imperatively necessary to carefully frame laws so as to prevent any class, profession, sect, or group of people from gaining a position that might enable them to infringe on the rights of the individual through legislative warrant or bureaucratic rulings."

We venture the prediction that a law passed for the genuine protection of the people, such as Mr. Flower advocates above, would do more to protect the people from the danger of the drug habit and to defend and protect them from being made the victims of deception on the part of proprietary medicine manufacturers or doctors, than all the class medical legislation that the monopoly-seeking doctors have secured during the past 50 years, but such legislation would not promote the monopoly the political doctors are seeking, and would protect the people from dangerous prescriptions as well as questionable medicines that may be put upon the market. It would be important and genuine protective legislation in so far as the people are concerned, and it would not be class legislation in the interest of the increased power and wealth for State-protected or privileged doctors. Hence such legislation would be opposed by the political doctors just as it was opposed by them when offered by the Hon. Charles W. Miller in the Iowa Legislature.

3. Next we come to notice the attack by insinuation on the Hon. Charles W. Miller, second vice president of the league. This attack is as follows:

"Charles W. Miller, second vice president of the league, was also one of the founders. In his newspaper, which publishes patent-medicine advertising, he has constantly fought the medical profession. Last year one of his addresses against what he called 'a doctors' trust' was delivered to the Dairy Association of Baltimore. We may say in passing that Collier's does not believe in freedom to sell tuberculosis milk any more than it does to sell tuberculosis meat."

Mr. Miller has for years been the Democratic leader of the Iowa Legislature, and was formerly State chairman of the Democratic Party. His position shows the confidence of his own neighbors and of his party in his intelligence and uprightness. He owned until lately a county newspaper, and it is probable that he published proprietary medicine advertisements in his columns, as does almost every struggling county newspaper in the land. Mr. Miller has opposed the attempts of the doctors to blacklist other physicians in the interest of the doctors' monopoly or union. He opposed the attempt to raise the fee scale that would take vast sums from the pockets of the struggling farmers and working men and women unfortunate enough to be sick, and he tried to secure legislation that would compel the doctors to write their prescriptions which contained deadly poisons and habit-forming drugs in plain English and in red ink, so that their patients might enjoy at least measurable protection against drugs that might easily enslave them or injure their constitutions. All these things, which right-minded people will heartily applaud, were doubtless grievous offenses in the eyes of Drs. Simmons, McCormack, and Reed, the three master spirits in building up the politico-medical machine of the American Medical Association, and also in the eyes of Collier's, which appears to hold a brief for this association. Again, it is doubtless true, as Collier's points out, that Mr. Miller appeared before a dairy association, just as he has appeared before the congressional committee and has appeared before various other public bodies, to protest against the monopoly-seeking legislation of the American Medical Association. To point out the trust character of the legislation sought by the political doctors may be a serious offense in the eyes of Collier's, but it is not likely to impress any unbiased or fair-minded person as being other than a perfectly proper proceeding, provided his position was well taken and his argument convincing, and all persons who have listened to Mr. Miller's arguments or read his addresses will, we think, be impressed with the fact that he has clearly established his claims,

and it will be observed that Collier's very carefully refrains from giving Mr. Miller's arguments. We venture to say that if they had published the address in full ninety-nine out of every hundred unbiased readers of that publication would have unhesitatingly declared that the member of the Iowa Legislature had thoroughly maintained his contention.

4. Next we come to Collier's attack on Mrs. Diana Belais. Perhaps nothing in this whole discreditable and shameless exhibition of the Collier brand of journalism is more characteristic or more calculated to arouse the contempt of all right-minded people than the following:

"Mrs. Diana Belais, a director and also a founder, has appeared before in this paper as president of an antiexperiment society—a well-meaning, but ignorant, reckless, and muddle-headed agitator."

Mrs. Belais is the president of the New York State Anti-Vivisection Society. She is a clear-visioned, logical, and intellectually brilliant woman, whose enlightened conscience revolts against the horrible sufferings imposed by the vivisectioners on helpless dumb animals. With her stand such distinctly great scientific physicians as Dr. Edward Berdce, M. R. C. S. (England) and L. R. C. P. (Edinburgh), one of England's greatest physicians, medical authors, and scientific investigators, and other physicians of international reputation.

Mrs. Belais's offense in the eyes of Collier's is that she has dared to oppose what thousands of the most enlightened of our people hold to be brutal, unnecessary, and dehumanizing cruelty practiced on dumb animals. The doctors wish a free hand in their reckless experimentation, and Collier's, in lieu of arguments to oppose Mrs. Belais's strong and reason-compelling pleas, resorts to abusive epithets against a high-minded, cultured, and thoroughly civilized woman, glibly characterizing her as "ignorant, reckless, and muddle-headed."

Last summer Mrs. Belais delivered an address before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives in Washington that was strong, clearly reasoned, and logical—an address which called forth a number of expressions of sincere admiration from those present, some of whom were not in sympathy with the league in its position. But because Mrs. Belais intelligently and ably opposes cruel experimentation on helpless animals, she is denounced as "ignorant, reckless, and muddle-headed" by this modern champion of monopoly-seeking doctors and twentieth century example of the chivalry of the press.

We confess we are surprised that W. R. Brown, first vice president of the league and manager of the Brown-Ketcham Co., one of the great steel constructing concerns of this country, escaped criticism, for is it not possible that some of the buildings erected by this company may to-day house druggists who make or at least sell proprietary medicines? Then there is Dr. Lewis Pinkerton Crutcher, registrar and professor of materia medica in the Hahnemann Medical College, of Kansas City, Mo., one of the ablest educators, authors, and physicians in the homeopathic school; Dr. Harry C. Chiles, one of the leading osteopaths of the land. Both these men are representative and influential members in their schools of practice and are active directors in the league, and, as Collier's must know, would not actively associate with any organization that was promoted by the proprietary medicine interests or those who opposed pure-food legislation. Then there is Col. Frederick C. Bangs, another active director, who is a prominent attorney in Chicago. Is it possible that Collier's sleuths have been unable to discover some instance where Col. Bangs may have been consulted by a druggist or some person who makes or sells proprietary medicines?

5. So much for the active officers of the league. Next Collier's attacks the personnel of the advisory board of the league. Out of 200 members of this board the editor of Collier's has been able to discover but 3 persons who either at some time were interested in proprietary medicine interests or who have defended the proprietary medicine interests against the champions of the ethical remedies, many of which are deadly poisons, but which are approved by the American Medical Association. He finds that S. C. Carr, the editor of the Columbus Medical Journal, was at one time interested in a proprietary medical concern; that George P. Englehard, editor of the Medical Standard, has defended proprietary medicine interests; and that Charles Huhn, president of the National Association of Retail Druggists, is an officer in a cooperative proprietary medical concern. After a year Collier's sleuths have actually found 3 persons out of 200 who are or have been connected with proprietary medicine interests or who have had the temerity to say a good word for these medicines, and all this is advanced to prove that the National League for Medical Freedom is, to use the elegant language of this journal of civilization, "a bad bunch," and that it is opposed to pure-food legislation and an upholder of proprietary medicine interests. Collier's very wisely refrains from calling attention to the advisory board of the league as a whole, as its list contains as notable a company of strong, fine, public-spirited men and women as we think have ever appeared on an advisory board of any organization.

A few typical names on this list will show why Collier's does not care to mention the personnel of the advisory board. Among the distinguished physicians are: Dr. William E. Leonard, for 19 years professor of materia medica in the University of Minnesota; Dr. A. F. Stephens, one of the leading physicians, educators, and authors of the eclectic school of medicine; Dr. W. A. Dewey, editor of the Medical Century, one of the largest homeopathic journals published; Dr. Joseph D. Harrigan, New York City, a prominent homeopathic physician; Dr. John Perrins, vice president of the National Eclectic Medical Association; Dr. George W. Thompson, president of the faculty of the Eclectic College of New York; Dr. Claude E. Laws, president of the Arkansas State Eclectic Board of Medical Examiners; Edmund Vance Cook, author and lecturer; Charles Major, the popular author; William Ordway Partridge, the eminent sculptor; Orison S. Marden, editor of Success; Mrs. Clara Barton; Mrs. John Logan; Mrs. George T. Oliver; May Wright Sewall; ex-United States Senator William V. Allen; William D. Baldwin, president of the Otis Elevator Co., of New York City; Col. Robert C. Clowry, ex-president of the Western Union Telegraph Co.; Benage S. Joselin, president of the Portland Railway, Light & Power Co.; and Edwin T. Earl, publisher of the Los Angeles Express. These names are typical representatives of the advisory board and the membership of the National League for Medical Freedom—the league which Collier's would have its credulous readers believe is the enemy of the public weal.

Evidently fearing the loss of subscriptions from Christian Scientists, Collier's throws this sop to them: "Few mere observers rate the benefits that Christian Science has brought the community more highly than we do." And yet the fact remains, and none know this fact better than Collier's, that the American Medical Association, whose program is so enthusiastically indorsed by Collier's, through its State societies has been seeking and is seeking tirelessly to secure legislation that would prevent Christian Scientists from practicing, and thus deprive tens and hundreds of thousands of intelligent American people from the

enjoyment of this treatment when they desire its administration. At the present time in the city in which Collier's magazine is published the New York Medical Society, a component part of the State society, which in turn is an integral part of the American Medical Association, is trying through the courts to harass Christian Science practitioners under legislation which the doctors claimed when it was passed would not interfere with such practice.

6. The league has consistently from the beginning addressed itself to appeals to the reason of the public by arguments and citations of facts to maintain its position. It has held that certain great vital issues are at stake, issues vital to the most sacred rights of the people, and also to the cause of sound scientific advancement, and it has chosen to advance arguments rather than to indulge in abusive epithets. It has refused to engage in a mud-slinging campaign, and has only asked that the issues involved be fairly met and freely discussed, but in passing it may be pardoned for venturing an observation as a possible explanation for the activity of Collier's in its militant championing of the American Medical Association and the political doctors.

Some years ago when Collier's was preparing to attack the proprietary medicines its canvassers were sent to the doctors with special inducements to subscribe. A well-known physician thus describes the methods of the canvasser who approached him: After extolling Collier's and showing a book premium that made the magazine practically a free gift or the book a free gift if the doctor would consent to take Collier's—we do not remember now which way the matter was put by the canvasser—he next proceeded to enlarge on the fact that the American people were paying out millions of dollars every year for proprietary medicines that ought to go into the pockets of the doctors. Now, he explained Collier's proposed to make a great campaign against the proprietary medicines, and this would naturally greatly increase the revenues of the doctors. Therefore the doctors should support Collier's. This was the substance of the canvasser's song, and doubtless through this method Collier's received a great number of physicians as subscribers. Naturally enough they desire to retain this clientele, and there is nothing discreditable about their desire to do so, even by opposing the league, provided that in doing so they employ honorable methods of argument instead of resorting to a mud-slinging attack marked by vituperations, abusive epithets, and unjustifiable innuendos. Had the league desired to turn aside from its campaign addressed to the reason and sense of fairness of the people and marked by arguments, historical facts, and legitimate conclusions to a criticism of the personnel of the master spirits of the opposition, it could have easily dwelt at length on the damaging and unrefuted charges that have been advanced against a number of those who have been chiefly responsible for building up the political machine of the American Medical Association, but it has striven to hold to principles, and not cloud its issues by injecting personalities into its campaign, feeling that its cause was just, righteous, and in the interests of the cause of scientific advance no less than of the people's rights.

SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF THE BILL.

Mr. President, I now come to a consideration of the scope of the bill itself as it is presented. In order to show what the position and understanding of the Senator from Oklahoma, the author of the bill, is, I desire to read a few words from what he said before the Senate committee having a similar bill under consideration:

Senator OWEN. Mr. Chairman, may I be permitted to make a statement?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Senator OWEN. I wish to say that the only important point in this bill is the coordination of the principal health agencies of the Government; the detail of it is a matter that is immaterial. The only question of importance is—and the only question upon which I personally desire to have the evidence is—the desirability of a department with a seat in the Cabinet. I do not care anything about the details. If the committee determines on a department then the details could be arranged, but the time is very short.

I also want in this connection to include in my remarks a short extract from an address of H. L. Gordon before the committee having the matter under consideration, setting out in a very brief way the objections to the bill. It is as follows:

AT THE MERCY OF OFFICIALS.

If you place in the hands of these men a power which has no limitations or restrictions, as I have said before, and which does not attempt to designate where or when or how an investigation as to some particular sickness or disease shall be made, if you give him the authority which the language of this bill unquestionably gives him, to determine for himself the necessity of such an investigation, and to act in accordance with that determination, even though the person afflicted with the disease which is to be investigated may have not even a remote connection with interstate commerce, you place the citizenship of this country absolutely at the mercy of the men who are connected with the Public Health Service.

Of course, it might be said that an individual under those circumstances could have relief by objecting to the authority of these people, and by resorting to the courts for an enforcement of his personal and individual rights. But, gentlemen of the committee, it must not be forgotten that the great respect which the citizenship of this country has for everything and everybody which bears the badge or acts with the authority of the Federal Government would prevent and make impossible in most cases the questioning of the authority with which these men would be clothed under this bill.

And it must not be further forgotten that this bill provides not only for the study and investigation of diseases of man, but it "authorizes the study and investigation of the conditions influencing the propagation and spread thereof," and that therefore it is not putting the case too strongly when we suggest that this not only authorizes the invasion of the homes of this country for the purpose of investigating some particular sickness or disease that may exist there, but it authorizes the invasion of those homes for the further purpose of investigating the conditions that surround them, to enable the particular representative of the Public Health Service who may be making the investigation to determine from his standpoint and according to the teachings of his school of medicine what the cause of that disease might be.

A MONOPOLY THE AIM.

But there is one fact which, it seems to me, plays a very important part in determining whether or not such a power as this should be given to the Public Health Service. It is a fact, as I am informed, and

it is a fact that should have great weight with this committee and with every Member of the National Congress in considering legislation of this kind, that the men in whose hands the powers delegated by this bill are put all belong to one school of medicine. And it does not change the situation, nor does it weaken the effect of the argument in opposition to this bill, that this particular school of medicine is the one upon which I call, or upon which you call, when we believe medical assistance to be necessary for ourselves or our families.

Indeed I have no hesitancy in stating to this committee that the men who represent the Federal Government in its health activities are all from the school of medicine which I always employ when I feel the necessity of calling upon anyone because of the impaired health of myself or my family. But because of my relations with these men it does not change the situation with reference to my attitude toward legislation of this kind. Indeed I might say to this committee that the very man who is my family physician and adviser is one of the leading lights in the organization which is back of and prompting all this sort of legislation, but I recognize the fact that in his activity he is only pushing forward the interest of himself and those whom he represents, which interests are not such as should influence this committee or the Congress of the United States in carrying out their wishes.

The fact is, gentlemen of the committee, that if the public health service is given the power which this particular provision of this bill would confer upon it, this particular school of medicine, which fills every position under the health activities of this Government, would be enabled, through the power and money of the Federal Government, to disseminate its views as to the causes of disease and as to the remedies which should be adopted by the citizenship of this country, to the exclusion of all the other opinions and remedies of the many other schools of medicine in this country.

In Ohio the advisory board, which acts for and represents the people for whom I appear in this case, is composed of one of the most prominent and influential homeopathic physicians in the city of Cincinnati; of the leader of the school of osteopathy in that city; of a lawyer, who, like myself, still follows and believes in the teachings of the school of medicine which controls the activities of the health interests in the Federal Government. These men are active in this movement not because they are opposed to the protection of the health of the people, not because they are prejudiced against any particular school of medicine, but because they are opposed to the Federal Government placing in the hands of one particular school of medicine the funds and the activities of this Government, by which the ideas and the conclusions of that particular school may be disseminated and scattered broadcast among the people of this country at the expense of the Federal Government.

BASIS OF OBJECTION.

That is why, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the homeopath and the osteopath and the eclectic physicians all unite in this protest against this sort of legislation and call upon you to consider their interests as well as the interests of those men who already control and fill the various positions under the Federal Government which are created under the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service.

Now, I call attention to the provisions of the bill which seem to me to be important in this connection; and on the first page, commencing with line 5, is this clause:

And the provisions of title 4 of the Revised Statutes, including all amendments thereto, are hereby made applicable to said department.

Now, that, on the face of it, is a very innocent reference. One would hardly realize, I think, all that it means. In order that Senators may understand just what is brought into this bill by that reference I desire very briefly to call attention to title 4 of the Revised Statutes, made a part of the bill.

Section 158, found on page 26 of the Revised Statutes, is as follows:

The provisions of this title shall apply to the following executive departments:

Then the departments are enumerated, and, of course, if this bill were adopted it would add one more to the number of departments. Then follows this section:

Each head of a department is entitled to a salary of \$10,000 a year, to be paid monthly. * * *

Also:

SEC. 161. The head of each department is authorized to prescribe regulations, not inconsistent with law, for the government of his department, the conduct of its officers and clerks, the distribution and performance of its business, and the custody, use, and preservation of the records, papers, and property appertaining to it.

Now, Mr. President, that provision brought into this bill by reference in that way gives the head of this department absolute and unlimited power to determine just what shall be done by him in carrying out the purposes of the bill, unless it be in violation of law. Therefore I say that except as to the restraints of the law that are thrown about every public official the power of the head of this department will be absolutely unlimited. When we come to consider the bill itself we find that its provisions are equally broad and unlimited in their terms.

Section 3 of the bill provides—

That it be the province and duty of the department of health to foster and promote all matters pertaining to the conservation and improvement of the public health and to collect and disseminate information relating thereto.

Language could hardly be broader and more unlimited than that. It gives him absolute power to control the situation—

Provided, That this act shall not be construed as attempting to authorize the department of health to exercise, or attempt to exercise, without express invitation from the chief executive or other proper

authority of the State, any function belonging exclusively to such State, or to enter any premises in any State without the consent of the owner or occupant thereof.

I desire to call the particular attention of the Senator from Oklahoma to that language. It has been stated here that the purpose was to prevent the entrance into any family or any home under the provisions of this bill. But the Senator from Oklahoma will see that this provision in the bill only applies to residents of the States and does not limit the power in the slightest degree on the part of the head of this department or of any of his officers or employees to enter the home of any family in territory under Federal jurisdiction—for example, in the District of Columbia—at his will. There is no restraint whatever upon him.

I think you will find that right here in the city of Washington there are hundreds of Christian Scientists who do not believe in the administration of drugs as a remedy. They do not believe in the practice as it is carried on by regular physicians, and they would dislike exceedingly to have their homes entered for any such purpose as that; and yet under this bill as it is drawn that power does exist, and there is no limitation of the power.

Now, I come to that clause in the bill that was referred to by the Senator from Oklahoma awhile ago with respect to the attempt in the bill to prevent any interference with the practice of healing on the part of any other than the regular schools of medicine. I think the Senator from Oklahoma has overestimated the effect of that clause in the bill. It does not provide in terms or in any other way that there shall be no discrimination between different schools of medicine or different methods of healing. It simply provides that the department of health shall recognize no so-called school or system of medicine. I do not know exactly what the Senator understands by the use of the word "recognized." According to that there could be no recognition of any school of medicine. But it does exclude everybody else except those of schools of medicine, as the Senator will see. Whether that was his intention or not, I do not know. But certainly it does, as in case of almost every piece of legislation that is attempted to be passed in Congress or elsewhere, absolutely exclude Christian Scientists from any protection by the provisions of the bill.

Does the Senator from Oklahoma desire now to ask any questions in respect to it? I declined to be interrupted before. I meant no discourtesy to the Senator, as I think he will understand.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I started to interrupt the Senator when he was making his argument, but, feeling that it would, perhaps, interfere with the coherency of his presentation, I did not do so.

The bill was drawn deliberately and intentionally to prevent any discrimination against Christian Science, osteopathy, or any other school of medicine or of healing; and I thought the Senator, when he was criticizing the bill as establishing a department of medicine in control of one school or another school, had possibly overlooked the language of section 3. For that reason I asked him whether or not he understood that the bill intended to discriminate in favor of one school or another school or to recognize one school or another school.

Mr. WORKS. I may say to the Senator with respect to that matter that I do not believe the bill was intended on its face, or does upon its face, discriminate in favor of any school of medicine. But I desire to show, and will now proceed to do so, that such would be the effect of it, whether it is the intention of the Senator from Oklahoma in this bill to bring about that result or not. For this simple reason: Taking the medical bureaus as they exist at this time, you will be unable to find in any single one of them any medical practitioner who is not of the regular school of medicine.

Mr. OWEN. I should like to ask the Senator, if it will not interrupt him, whether or not this bill can be perfected by the use of any words whatever so as to accomplish the purpose of safeguarding the public health without promoting any particular school of medicine or so as to avoid the objection he makes.

Mr. WORKS. Well, I think that is very doubtful. It might be possible. The trouble about it is, I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma, that you must have a head to an organization of this sort. It may be of the regular school; it may be of the homeopathic school; whatever the head of the bureau or department may be, he is entitled to make such regulations as he pleases with respect to the conduct of the bureau or department. Now, if he makes such rules and regulations as will exclude all but one school of medicine, what can be done by legislation to prevent that result?

It does not make any difference whether it is of the regular school or some other school. I have just as much objection to the domination of a Government organization of this kind by one school of medicine as another. I would have just as much objection, and it would be just as objectionable, however I may feel with respect to that matter, to have it dominated and controlled by Christian Scientists, even if I believed that that would be better for the people of this country, because I think it is unjust. But how we are going to have any legislation of this kind without placing in the head of the department the control of all these things I am unable to see.

Now, if the Senator from Oklahoma is skillful enough to provide a law that will avoid any such thing as that, it would remove many of the objectionable features of the bill, I am frank to say to him.

ALL BUT ONE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE EXCLUDED.

In order to verify what I have said with respect to the physicians and surgeons now in the employ of the Government, I desire to insert as a part of my remarks letters and memoranda which I have received from the different departments of the Government having to do with the medical branch of the service. First is a letter from the Superintendent of the Government Hospital for the Insane, in which he gives the number of the medical employees, and in which he states in terms:

I may say that all of the physicians in the hospital are of the regular school.

The letter and accompanying memorandum are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL FOR THE INSANE,
Washington, D. C., May 8, 1911.

Hon. JOHN D. WORKS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I have your letter of the 6th instant making certain inquiries in regard to the number of people employed in this hospital in the care of the insane. In reply I inclose a tabulated statement which was gotten up in March, 1910, for the information of Senator OWEN, who then had a bill before the Senate for the establishment of a department of health, and who requested the different departments to give this sort of information. This table is approximately true at the present time. I may say that all of the physicians in the hospital are of the regular school.

I shall be very glad to give you any additional information you may desire.

Respectfully,
WM. A. WHITE, Superintendent.
[Inclosure.]

| Employees of the Government Hospital for the Insane. | Male. | Female. | Total. |
|--|-------|---------|--------|
| Physicians and medical employees..... | 20 | 4 | 24 |
| Ward service (supervisors, nurses, attendants, etc.).. | 236 | 96 | 332 |
| The number of other employees necessary to properly conduct the work of the institution, not included in the above list..... | 270 | 160 | 430 |
| Grand total..... | | | 786 |

I submit also the memorandum furnished me from the Surgeon General of the Army showing the number of physicians and employees in the Medical Department of the Army, and also that all of them are of the regular school:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL,
Washington, May 10, 1911.

Memorandum for the honorable the Secretary of War.

There are in the employ of the Medical Department of the Army—
Regular medical officers..... 384
Medical Reserve Corps officers..... 135
Contract surgeons..... 14
533

All of these are graduates of the regular school.

GEO. H. TORNEY,
Surgeon General United States Army.

Then, from the Secretary of the Navy, who says:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, May 9, 1911.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Your letter of the 6th instant reached me yesterday and, in reply, I write to inform you that there are at present 304 members of the regular Medical Corps of the Navy and 6 acting assistant surgeons appointed for temporary service. I regret that it is impracticable to inform you as to the number of representatives from the various schools of medicines, as this is not a matter of record.

Candidates for the Medical Corps are required to pass satisfactorily a practical examination in the usual branches of medicine and surgery, and they must also have a good, general preliminary education.

Faithfully, yours,

GEO. VON L. MEYER.

Hon. JOHN D. WORKS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Mr. OWEN rose.

Mr. WORKS. Just one moment. While the letter does not disclose the fact, I think I can say with perfect assurance that

all of the medical employees in that department are like the others, of the regular school of medicine. Does the Senator from Oklahoma know of anything to the contrary?

Mr. OWEN. I simply rose to ask the Senator whether he thought those who are employed in the Army and Navy should not have taken such courses of instruction as are available in the country, and if it is to be regarded as a discredit that they should have graduated in such schools of medicine as we have in this country?

Mr. WORKS. Not in the least. I am not criticizing them because they have been graduated from any school of medicine. I am not criticizing in the least their competency or efficiency in the service. It is not that. It may be, and I presume it is, a fact that the surgeons and assistant surgeons and various medical employees are perfectly efficient in the service to which they belong. I am not intending to criticize them. I am simply calling attention to the fact that all of them are of a particular school of medicine, whether good or bad, and therefore the natural result of organizing a department of this kind would be to bring about exactly the same result with respect to the employees under that department.

Mr. OWEN. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not a fact that all of the employees of the Government at present engaged would come within the scope of his criticism?

Mr. WORKS. I desire to say, and I think I said awhile ago, and I do not think the Senator from Oklahoma could have misunderstood me, that my remarks are not intended in any sense to be a criticism.

Mr. OWEN. Well, then, subject to the comment of the Senator that they are graduates of regular schools.

Mr. WORKS. That is no discredit to them, I will say to the Senator. I am not pressing it as in any way discreditable to them.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLETCHER in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. WORKS. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator know whether a graduate of the homeopathic school could be to-day employed in the Navy or the Army of the United States? In other words, are the requirements of the Army and Navy such that a graduate of that particular school can enter either branch? Does the Senator know?

Mr. WORKS. I do not.

Mr. OWEN. I would respond to that by saying that regardless of whether a man is a graduate or not, as I understand the practice of the service, it is to subject the individual to a personal examination as to the extent of his knowledge to determine whether or not he is fitted by his training to serve the public in this way.

Mr. SMOOT rose.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, just a moment. If that examination were made by a board of examiners consisting alone of regular physicians, I apprehend that nobody could pass the examination except one who could qualify as a regular physician.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I was going to suggest.

Mr. WORKS. That I understood to be the condition, but when the Senator from Utah asks me whether I know that to be so, I do not.

Mr. OWEN. I should like to suggest to the Senator from California that the character of the examination could be easily framed so that the examination is by number, without disclosing the identity of the applicant at all; and that ought to be the rule in making the examinations.

Mr. WORKS. I do not know that that would help the situation, but I understand that is not so at the present time.

Mr. OWEN. I do not know whether it is true or not at the present time. Who does assert that it is not true?

Mr. WORKS. I do not. I say I do not know that it is true at the present time.

Mr. OWEN. Does anyone assert it is not true?

Mr. WORKS. No, sir. I do not profess to know anything about it. If I were asked my opinion about it, I would say that my opinion is that nothing of that kind exists; but I do not know it.

Mr. President, in closing I want to call attention to a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of American School of Magnetic Healing against McAnnulty, in which the question rose as to the right of the Postmaster General to exclude from the mails certain advertisements by one who was claiming to be a magnetic healer and advertising his business. The question arose whether the Postmaster General had any right to determine that question, and whether he could on his own belief of what was right or what was wrong with respect

to the healing of disease say that this thing or that thing should be excluded from the mails as fraudulent and in violation of law.

I am not saying this because I believe in the mode of healing that is carried on by magnetic healers, for I do not; but their rights are just like those of any American citizen so long as they are not violating the law in any way; and the principle upon which the Supreme Court acted in that matter is quite important as bearing upon the powers that might be given to the head of this department.

The Supreme Court say, on pages 103 to 106 of volume 187 of the United States Supreme Court decisions:

There can be no doubt that the influence of the mind upon the physical condition of the body is very powerful, not only to alleviate but even to aid very largely in the cure of an illness from which the body may suffer. And it is said that nature may itself frequently, if not generally, heal the ills of the body without recourse to medicine, and that it can not be doubted that in numerous cases nature, when left to itself, does succeed in curing many bodily ills. How far these claims are borne out by actual experience may be matter of opinion. Just exactly to what extent the mental condition affects the body no one can accurately and definitely say. One person may believe it of far greater efficacy than another, but surely it can not be said that it is a fraud for one person to contend that the mind has an effect upon the body and its physical condition greater than even a vast majority of intelligent people might be willing to admit or believe. Even intelligent people may, and indeed do, differ among themselves as to the extent of this mental effect. Because the complainants might or did claim to be able to effect cures by reason of working upon and affecting the mental powers of the individual and directing them toward the accomplishment of a cure of the disease under which he might be suffering, who can say that it is a fraud or a false pretense or promise within the meaning of these statutes? How can anyone lay down the limit and say beyond that there are fraud and false pretenses? The claim of the ability to cure may be vastly greater than most men would be ready to admit, and yet those who might deny the existence or virtue of the remedy would only differ in opinion from those who assert it.

Suppose a person should assert that by the use of electricity alone he could treat diseases as efficaciously and successfully as the same have heretofore been treated by "regular" physicians. Would these statutes justify the Postmaster General, upon evidence satisfactory to him, to adjudge such claim to be without foundation, and then to pronounce the person so claiming to be guilty of procuring by false or fraudulent pretenses the moneys of people sending him money through the mails, and then to prohibit the delivery of any letters to him? The moderate application of electricity, it is strongly maintained, has great effect upon the human system, and just how far it may cure or mitigate diseases no one can tell with certainty. It is still in an empirical stage, and enthusiastic believers in it may regard it as entitled to a very high position in therapeutics, while many others may think it absolutely without value or potency in the cure of disease. Was this kind of question intended to be submitted for decision to a Postmaster General? And was it intended that he might decide the claim to be a fraud, and enjoin the delivery of letters through the mail addressed to the person practicing such treatment of disease? As the effectiveness of almost any particular method of treatment of disease is, to a more or less extent, a fruitful source of difference of opinion, even though the great majority may be of one way of thinking, the efficacy of any special method is certainly not a matter for the decision of the Postmaster General within these statutes relative to fraud.

Vaccination is believed by many to be a preventive of smallpox, while others regard it as unavailing for that purpose. Under these statutes, could the Postmaster General, upon evidence satisfactory to him, decide that it was not a preventive, and exclude from the mails all letters to one who practiced it and advertised it as a method of prevention, on the ground that the moneys he received through the mails were procured by false pretenses?

Again, there are many persons who do not believe in the homeopathic school of medicine, and who think that such doctrine, if practiced precisely upon the lines set forth by its originator, is absolutely inefficacious in the treatment of diseases. Are homeopathic physicians subject to be proceeded against under these statutes and liable at the discretion of the Postmaster General, upon evidence satisfactory to him, to be found guilty of obtaining money under false pretenses and their letters stamped as fraudulent and the money contained therein as payment for their professional services sent back to the writers of the letters? And, turning the question around, can physicians of what is called the "old school" be thus proceeded against? Both of these different schools of medicine have their followers, and many who believe in the one will pronounce the other wholly devoid of merit. But there is no precise standard by which to measure the claims of either, for people do recover who are treated according to the one or the other school. And so, it is said, do people recover who are treated under this mental theory? By reason of it? That can not be averred as matter of fact. Many think they do. Others are of the contrary opinion. Is the Postmaster General to decide the question under these statutes?

I ask, if that be true, if the head of this department can determine that question in favor of one school of medicine to the exclusion of the other?

Mr. OWEN. I did not quite catch the force of the decision. It was to the effect that the Postmaster General could not discriminate against the magnetic healers. Would not that rule protect others from like discriminations—

Mr. WORKS. Not at all.

Mr. OWEN. Who occupied a similar position?

Mr. WORKS. It would so far as the use of the mails is concerned, but if a department of health—

Mr. OWEN. The spirit of the decision is to protect the individual in the practice of medicine.

Mr. WORKS. Certainly. I have said that if the head of the department goes so far as to violate the law he is subject to the law in that respect; but so long as he keeps himself within the law there is absolutely no limit to his power.

Mr. President, I have said all that I desire to say on this subject. I have tried to discuss it with fairness and without any hostility toward anybody of any school of medicine or healing. I have no animosity or antipathy toward any school of medicine or anyone who is engaged in the practice of medicine. I recognize the fact that all schools of medicine are doing good at the present time in this country, and their rights should be fully respected. On the other hand, the mode of healing in which I believe is entitled to the same degree of justice as those who are practicing other means of healing disease.

Senators may not agree with me as to the efficacy of that sort of treatment. I am quite sure many of them do not. But that is not the question. If I believe in it I have a perfect right under the laws of this country to secure for myself such medical or other treatment as I desire, and it would be a violation not only of my rights, generally speaking, but it would be a violation of the very spirit of the Constitution to forbid me the right to resort to that sort of help that I believe to be most efficient in my own case. I would not have anyone denied the right which belongs to him in the use of drugs. That is his right, whether I believe in it or not; but I insist, on the other hand, that those of us who believe in another and different sort of remedy for our ills have exactly the same right to resort to that remedy that the man has who believes in the use of drugs as a remedy.

Mr. OWEN. Before the Senator takes his seat, there are one or two questions I would like to ask him, if it would be agreeable to him.

Mr. WORKS. Certainly.

Mr. OWEN. Does the Senator understand that a national department of health would engage in the issuance of licenses to practitioners and deny licenses to Christian Science practitioners?

Mr. WORKS. I do not know whether they would or not. They could make regulations under your bill.

Mr. OWEN. That might be directly averted by forbidding it, but the practice of the United States, under the limitations of constitutional law, is that all licenses to practice "healing" or "medicine" are given by the State laws and not by the Federal Government. I think perhaps the Senator may have overlooked that. I do not think the Federal Government has any right whatever to issue licenses within a State for the practice of medicine.

Mr. WORKS. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. OWEN. I think there is no constitutional right to do it.

Mr. WORKS. I agree with the Senator in respect to the exercise of that power in the States. That matter I have not discussed. I may discuss it at some future time if it becomes necessary. I have not undertaken to discuss the general principles involved or the constitutionality of the bill. I agree to what the Senator says, that the Federal department would have no right to interfere with the affairs of a State. But I have this to say, that the indications are, from what is said by some of these doctors, that they believe just that can be done, because one of them, as I remember, distinctly referred to the fact that they might elevate the efficiency of the State boards of health and various other things. That would be an interference with the constitutional rights of the States.

Mr. OWEN. The Senator has spoken, Mr. President, of the value of Christian Science. I myself believe it has been very efficacious in many instances. What the process is by which recovery is accomplished I do not think is thoroughly understood. But I should like to ask the Senator, in view of his confidence in its value, would it not be well to have the health officials we now have in Nation and in State give a proper study to it, with a view to ascertaining its value and giving it to the public when they have found its value?

Mr. WORKS. If the doctors, surgeons, and others who have charge of the medical bureaus of the Government would go about an examination of a matter of that kind in a right spirit, as I think the Senator from Oklahoma would, I believe it would be a very excellent thing to do. If they should go about it in the frame of mind which generally exists upon the part of medical practitioners, it would be useless.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I understood from the general discussion of the Senator from California that he was under the impression that Senate bill 6049 had been prepared by the American Medical Association.

Mr. WORKS. No; I think the Senator got that impression from something I read to the effect that their legislative committee would frame a bill. I said nothing about it. I know nothing about it.

Mr. OWEN. The bill which was introduced to establish a department of health at the last Congress was written by myself alone. I dictated every word of it.

Mr. WORKS. I did not controvert that in the least; I did not intend to do it.

Mr. OWEN. Does the Senator believe that under this bill the officers of the Federal department proposed could invade the private homes of citizens without the consent of the citizens?

Mr. WORKS. Yes; except in the States.

Mr. OWEN. Except in the States. That objection, then, might be easily obviated by inserting "the District of Columbia and the Territories" in the face of Senate bill No. 1.

Mr. WORKS. That could be easily obviated.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to ask the Senator from California a question. I am impressed with his discussion of this subject. Does the Senator believe that the law now upon the statute book is adequate, or would he suggest some change in the law under which we have now a bureau known as the bureau of health? I merely wish the Senator's view on that point.

Mr. WORKS. I believe everything that is desired to be accomplished through this bill, except the establishment of a department and the making of the head of that department—a member of the Cabinet, could be accomplished by legislation with respect to the medical bureau as it exists at the present time without the establishment of a department.

Mr. SMOOT. And at a great deal less expense.

Mr. WORKS. And at a great deal less expense.

Mr. OWEN. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not a fact that Great Britain, Germany, France, and other leading nations of the world have departments of health?

Mr. WORKS. I am not informed, Mr. President, whether they have or not, and I should not care whether they have or not. They have not our Constitution or our form of government, which, I think, makes a great difference.

Mr. OWEN. I suggest to the Senator that the people who inhabit those countries have the same kind of bodies and die in the same kind of fashion, and may be protected from exposure in the same improved methods.

Mr. WORKS. Yes; and if permitted to do so, they would probably desire the same freedom we receive for those bodies and their treatment that I am contending for.

Mr. OWEN. I respond to that by saying that the people of Australia and New Zealand have the same degree of freedom we have, and in those countries the death rate under a better administration of government is only nine and a half to the thousand, whilst ours is sixteen and a half to the thousand. We lose over 600,000 people a year unnecessarily in this country by preventable causes.

Mr. WORKS. Does the Senator attribute that to the health department as it is there constituted?

Mr. OWEN. I do; and to the care of the people by the laws as administered in those countries.

Mr. WORKS. Then the Senator must intend to reflect on the department as we have it now, not only the Federal department but the boards of health in the several States. I think myself that they are fairly efficient.

Mr. OWEN. I do say that they are not everywhere as efficient as they ought to be. They ought to be made more efficient, and that is the purpose of this bill.

Mr. WORKS. Then the Senator proposes to make State boards of health more efficient through the Federal department. That is just the thing I object to.

Mr. OWEN. Only in so far as a good example and publicity of ascertained fact might be of service. I will say that some of the States have departments which are excellently well conducted that might well serve as an example and pattern for the United States, that the good example of the one will serve a valuable purpose in impressing the other, and that a reasonable mutual emulation on the part of the departments of health in the various States and in the Federal Government would serve a useful purpose in promoting a knowledge of the laws of health and protecting men against unnecessary death and from the inefficiency of unnecessary and avoidable disease, the annual present cost of which has been demonstrated to be about four thousand millions of dollars.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I want to trespass for only a few moments upon the time of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA], who has given notice that he will address the Senate to-day.

Yesterday, in a colloquy with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the attitude of the German Government with reference to agriculture and the tariff was referred to. I was unable at that time to turn to some data which I had, but which I now have before me, and desire to put into the RECORD in connection with that statement.

In 1879 Mr. Bismarck said in debate in the Reichstag:

Is not the moment approaching when our agriculture will no longer be able to exist because corn is pressed down to a price at which it can not be remuneratively produced in Germany, taxation, the cost of living, and the cost of land being as they are? When that moment comes, then not only agriculture but the Prussian State and the German Empire will go to ruin as well.

That marked the beginning of the change of policy of Mr. Bismarck with reference to duties upon farm products, and from that time he became an advocate of the protective policy in Germany and applied it equally to farm products with other articles.

Now, I read from a statement of Mr. James J. Hill, found in his book on Highways of Progress. Among other things therein discussed is the question of reciprocity:

How to meet German competition is to-day the study of every intelligent leader of industry and every cabinet on the Continent of Europe. It will be found that a large share of her world-wide success is due to symmetrical national development. Agricultural industry has not been slighted. Behold a contrast that throws light upon the idle host of England's unemployed marching despondently through streets whose shop windows are crowded with wares of German make. Between 1875 and 1900 in Great Britain 2,691,428 acres which were under cereals and 755,255 acres which were under green crops went out of cultivation. In Germany, during the same period, the cultivated area grew from 22,840,950 to 23,971,573 hectares, an increase of 5 per cent.

I also read in this connection a statement from the English tariff commission of 1906:

The causes of the decline in agriculture are world-wide in their operation, affecting all importing countries. The striking feature in the case of the United Kingdom is that agriculture has been more depressed than in any other country and more depressed than any other branch of economic activity. During the last 25 years the course of all agricultural prices has been the same downward direction, with the result that agriculture has been subject to a great combination of causes, all tending toward its depression.

The commission then proceeds:

European countries generally have pursued a policy involving import duties on agricultural produce, whereas in the United Kingdom agriculturists have been subject to the unrestricted importation of foreign produce on terms not dissimilar, in many cases, from those experienced by manufacturers who complain of dumping.

In this connection I call attention to another list of figures bearing upon that subject, it seems to me, if not directly, indirectly. In the great West, where the wheat acreage was once an average of 25 bushels per acre, it is now 14. The average wheat production of 40 different counties of northern Illinois is as follows: 1870, 10,476,011 bushels; in 1880, 7,122,963 bushels; in 1890, 5,073,070 bushels; in 1900, 637,450.

The average acreage in Indiana fell from 15.6 bushels to 14.4; Minnesota, 15.8 to 13; North Dakota, 14.4 to 10; the entire United States, 15.3 to 14.

The last available statistics show that our average wheat yield per acre is 13.5; Austria, 17; France, 19.8; Germany, 27.6; Great Britain, 32.2. Oats: United States, 30 bushels per acre; Germany, 46; Great Britain, 42. Barley: United States, 25; Germany, 33; Great Britain, 34.6.

I will not now trespass upon the time of the Senator from North Dakota to follow the statistics to show that the increase of production per acre in those countries began with the period of time when the countries began to give particular attention to their agricultural interests, either by way of increased duties upon imports or otherwise, and that the increase in production has steadily kept pace with the attention given to the matter by the Governments in different ways.

As I said yesterday, we have in this country one-half of our agricultural lands in private ownership not yet under cultivation. The last seven years have marked a noted increase in taking possession of the abandoned farms, the reclaiming of the land which was skinned over and from which the parties passed on to richer lands of the West between 1870 and 1890.

Not only have we the lands in private ownership, but we have, as I before stated, some 75,000,000 acres of public land which are agricultural lands, not including some ten or twelve million acres of swamp lands and perhaps five or seven million acres more of arid lands.

About 1870 there began the great immigration for the settlement of the agricultural lands of the West. The region was a vast one and easily reduced to cultivation. Transportation facilities were pushed in every direction.

From 1870 to 1900 we produced more agricultural products from this region alone than in all our history theretofore.

In 1860 there was under cultivation west of the Mississippi twenty-six and a half million acres; in 1900, 194,000,000 acres—a gain of 188,000,000.

We are preparing to admit to the same market and practically under the same Government a region of territory equal in extent and equal in richness and productiveness to the territory I am now referring to.

Between 1870 and 1890 we raised as much corn in the Mississippi Valley as had been produced in the United States up to 1870. Of wheat we produced one-half during that period of the total amount which had been produced up to 1870.

From 1840 to 1870 our per capita production of the staple cereals was 860 bushels—from 1870 to 1900, 1,450 bushels—notwithstanding the fact that the agricultural population relative to the total population of the Nation was greater from 1840 to 1870 than it was from 1870 to 1900.

As a result these farm prices began to decline until they went down about one-half below the point where they had ranged before, the price of wheat falling fully one-half and corn and oats even below. The farmer could not sell. He burned his corn for fuel and his wheat rotted in the field.

Year after year the farmer's actual expenses exceeded the price of his productions, but he could not close up like a manufacturing establishment. This was his home and he had to stay with it.

In this impoverished condition the usurer found a harvest, and every cent of profit, when there was any, was divided with the railroad, the money lender, and the manufacturer. The farmer was ground to the earth for years in the great West, as everyone knows and as the mortgage record during that period discloses, which has only begun to be cleared up within the last 8 or 10 years.

The effect of all this was to drive the people from the farms into the cities and to discourage them from going to the farms at all. The city population in 1850 was 12½ per cent of the whole population of the United States; in 1900 it was nearly 50 per cent of the whole population.

In 1870 all towns and cities together contained a population of 11,750,000; in 1900 they contained a population of 35,840,000, an increase in 30 years of 24,900,000, showing that as the increase of population during this period was 37,745,000 the cities got nearly two-thirds of it. In fact, from 1890 to 1900 nearly three-fourths of the population went to the cities and towns. From 1870 to 1900 our population increased 88 per cent, and during that time our city population increased two and one-half times. And as the cities grew and the great skyscrapers went up in the centers of population there were more and more abandoned farms all through New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, because they were driven from the farm lands, where they could not secure a competency, into this region where the effect of the tariff system was more beneficial and where they could secure a living and possibly educate their families.

Of all people engaged in gainful pursuits in 1870, 47.36 per cent were engaged in agriculture; in 1880, 44.3 per cent; in 1890, 37.7 per cent; and in 1900, 35.7 per cent.

Farm values went down, and those prosperous agricultural regions of the East became the scene of abandoned farms. The farmer of the East skinned his farm and went West.

The increase in agricultural values during those years was small, but the increase in other values was exceedingly great, such as manufacturing establishments and city property. The average acreage value of farm lands from 1860 to 1900 only increased \$4.70 per acre.

In 1850 the wealth of the agricultural classes was estimated at \$3,987,000,000, of the town and city classes at \$3,170,000,000, or at \$1,000,000,000 in favor of the agricultural classes. From 1870 to 1890 the city wealth was \$9,402,000,000; the agricultural wealth, \$3,000,000,000. From 1880 to 1890 the increase of city wealth was \$18,575,000,000; agricultural, \$4,000,000,000. From 1890 to 1900 the increase of city wealth was \$19,000,000,000; agricultural, \$4,500,000,000. In other words, from 1860 to 1900 the total increase of wealth in the city was \$59,811,000,000; the agricultural, \$12,547,000,000.

The multimillionaires are not from the agricultural fields of industry.

I have trespassed longer than I should have done on the Senator's notice, but I wanted to put these figures into the Record in connection with what was said yesterday.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Monday next, immediately after the conclusion of the morning business, I will address the Senate upon the reciprocity bill, and especially upon the amendments pending to that bill.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, on January 26, 1911, President Taft transmitted to the two Houses of Congress a special message embodying the Canadian trade agreement which is now before this body. I made some remarks on this measure on the 28th of February, and expressed the opinion that it would work a great injury to the farmers of this country and would be of no benefit to the consumers in the cities, for the reason that they do not buy the natural products direct from the farmers, but buy the manufactured articles and the secondary food products

on which the duties are retained. A further study of this question has not changed my views in this respect, and I may say that they are shared by the great majority of those most vitally interested in this matter—the farmers.

The farmers of this country are greatly concerned about the effects of this measure, and I venture to say that they are almost unanimous in their opposition to it. I know that that is the case in North Dakota and neighboring States. I believe it is true, as has been stated by representative men from agricultural districts, that never since the Civil War has the farmer been so aroused over any legislation as he is over this agreement. In many of the Western States they have held conventions to protest against it. In North Dakota, the State which I have the honor in part to represent, a nonpartisan State convention was held which more than 700 farmers and business men attended. The delegates to this convention were elected at conventions held in the different counties in the State by the farmers of the respective counties, and were expected to, and did, express the general view of the people of their respective sections with regard to this measure. This movement was not financed by anyone. The farmers attending the county conventions paid their own expenses and the delegates to the State convention paid their own expenses. At this convention the delegates, without regard to political party, were unanimous in denouncing this agreement, and a delegation was selected to come to Washington and urge the manifest injustice to the agricultural class of enacting such a measure as the one pending. This convention was not held because it was thought necessary to influence the attitude of the Senators and Congressmen from the State. They knew the position which their representatives had taken on this question. It was well known that the entire congressional delegation from the State would oppose the measure. The action was taken in the hope that the Senate and the Finance Committee would listen with open minds to the representations of the men whose market it was proposed to surrender to the Canadian farmers. They could not bring themselves to believe that Congress would willingly enact a measure the only apparent result of which would be to deprive the farmers of this country of hundreds of millions of dollars, for the benefit of the Canadian farmers and some of the trusts in our own country, if they only correctly understood the situation. Attempts have been made by part of, the press, and others, to discredit the delegations of farmers that came to Washington to protest against this measure and to create the impression that they were sent here by the Lumber Trust and other protected interests. I protest against these gratuitous insults to the representatives of the most important industry in this country, the only explanation of which is a desire to discredit all opposition to this measure, and I merely state a fact when I say that the unfairness which certain large papers have shown in the treatment of this question has resulted in diminishing to a large extent the power and influence of the press as a whole.

Some people have been able to delude themselves with the belief that this measure is approved of by the country as a whole, and that the farmers are indifferent to it. Nothing could be further from the truth. Various commercial organizations, it is true, and in some few instances State legislatures, have passed resolutions favoring it, but as was shown before the Senate Finance Committee, it is also true that in many instances, if not in most of them, these favorable resolutions were adopted because they were pressed by some interested person, and the majority of the other members had little idea of the real nature of the agreement. Sometimes they were adopted without a single member of the body or organization having seen a copy of the bill. The indifference of the farmer is apparent only to those viewing his attitude with a prejudiced eye, or else incapable of understanding how the farmer records his opposition to measures. Because there have been no riots among the farmers in opposition to this measure, that is not a sign that the farmers are indifferent. The farmer of this country is not a rioting person. He has a habit of recording his approval or disapproval of the acts of his Congressman and Senator in another way, and it is probable that some of those so busily engaged in discovering that the farmers are indifferent to this matter will have occasion to change their views when the ballots are next counted.

Mr. President, this measure has come to us as the result of what has been variously called a treaty and an agreement with Canada. If a treaty had been negotiated, it should have been submitted to the Senate for ratification, and a two-thirds vote would have been necessary to put it into effect. This measure is not a treaty, however, but legislation designed to put into effect an agreement made by the President with the Government of Canada. Such agreements are usually embodied in formal

treaties, but in this instance the President has taken it upon himself to make an agreement with a foreign nation, without consulting the Senate and without submitting the agreement to the Senate for ratification, as it was his duty to do under the Constitution, and has agreed as a part of the bargain with that foreign country to use his utmost efforts to secure the passage of laws putting that agreement into effect. The majority of the membership of this body seem to view this action on the part of the President with equanimity, whether they do not realize its real nature or else rely on the President's good sense not to enter into any agreement with foreign powers which would result disastrously to our country. There is no essential difference, however, between entering into an agreement of this kind and pledging himself to use all his efforts to secure the enactment of legislation carrying it into effect, and the entering into an agreement to aid some other power in the case of war and pledging himself to use his best efforts to secure the passage of bills appropriating the necessary moneys. I do not believe there is any danger that this will be done so long as the present incumbent of the presidential chair remains in the White House—notwithstanding the apprehensions of some people last spring—but if this precedent is established, if this invasion of the prerogatives of the Senate is countenanced, it will some time in the future return with evil results in its train, when some President whose penchant will be the extension of territorial dominion instead of the surrendering of the farmers' markets, will use the power of making agreements with foreign nations, which the Senate appears to be about to surrender to the President, in such a way as to involve our country in serious difficulties with other nations.

The bill which we have under consideration here is a revenue bill, and as such should have originated in the House of Representatives. In having the bill framed, so far as its essentials are concerned, and trying to force it through Congress, the President is exceeding his constitutional powers, and this violation assumes a decidedly serious aspect when we reflect that the action is being taken in accordance with a pledge given to a foreign nation. The Members of both Houses of Congress, as well as the people at large, have been in the habit of considering that the lawmaking power is lodged in Congress, and that the President has merely the veto power. We have assumed that when the Constitution stated this in plain words it meant just that. Now that this important measure is before us, however, a majority of the Members of the two Houses of Congress cheerfully acquiesce in the assumption of the President that he is the real lawmaking as well as the treaty-making body, and that the Congress has merely the veto power and that even this veto power should not be exercised free from pressure by the administration. The President, after having consulted representatives of a foreign country, has decided what measures ought to be passed by Congress, has had measures drafted, and is now under the pledge which he gave the Canadian Government, using all his power to secure the passage of the desired revenue legislation. The President has apparently come to the conclusion that he represents the people of this country both as executive and legislature, and that the two Houses of Congress are merely two bodies of men provided for by the Constitution, which he can unfortunately not get rid of, but which are to be ignored and coerced whenever he deems it necessary or expedient. I am not a lawyer and I shall not pursue this subject further—it has been touched on before and will no doubt be fully discussed before the close of this debate—but I confess that I can not view with the equanimity that others evince the usurpation of legislative power by the President, and the ignoring of the Senate in the making of agreements having the effect of treaties with foreign nations.

One noticeable feature of this debate, which has been remarked on by others, is the strange unwillingness of the supporters of this measure to explain what benefits the country will derive from it and to defend it and the President's action in entering into the agreement on the floor of the Senate. The result is that while there are a large number of Senators pointing out the defects of this measure and urging injurious results as reasons for defeating it or radically changing it, they have to carry on the debate without any presentation by the great majority of the supporters of the bill why they or anyone should be in favor of its passage. The supporters of the measure must surely have some reason for being in favor of it, and ought not to be averse to enlightening those of us who do not find that we can in good conscience support it. There have been no reasons presented to the Senate by the President or by those in charge of the bill why it should pass. It almost appears as though we are expected to accept the President's advice and pass whatever measures he may be pleased to submit to us without opposition and with only perfunctory debate.

The arguments advanced outside of this Chamber by friends of this agreement are various. It has been urged that it will tend to reduce the high cost of living, or at least prevent it from rising any higher; that it will benefit the farmer by giving him cheaper bran and shorts; that it will steady the wheat market in this country by preventing violent fluctuations at Liverpool due to the dumping of Canadian wheat into the Liverpool market, as this wheat will be absorbed by the storage facilities of the United States and more gradually shipped to Liverpool; that it will extend our markets; that it will promote commercial intercourse and increase our trade with Canada; that it will give us cheaper print paper; that it is a step toward free trade; and that it is the inauguration of a policy which will result in the annexation of Canada. Further, there is vague talk of the mutual benefits to be derived from closer trade relations with our neighbor on the north, without specifying what those benefits may be or showing how this agreement is going to bring them about.

The most superficial examination of this measure can not fail to impress on one's mind three facts in regard to it: The articles on which the duties are to be removed are practically all farm products or raw materials. The articles on which we reduce or remove the duties are the same ones on which Canada reduces or removes her duties. The farm products and raw materials from which the duties are removed are such as Canada expects to sell to us and not such as we might hope to sell to Canada. If we bear those facts in mind, it may aid us in determining what the purpose of the entering into this agreement was and what its probable effect will be.

The purpose of this bill is usually given as the promotion of commercial intercourse with Canada and the extension of our trade with that country. I do not believe anyone has as yet shown how it will increase our trade with Canada in any other way than by increasing our imports of agricultural products. Three considerations force themselves upon one in this connection: (1) If the purpose is to secure cheaper raw materials, the proper way is not to remove the duties only on Canadian products, but on the products of all countries. (2) If the purpose is to reduce the price of the commodities which the average consumer uses, the way to do this is to remove or greatly reduce the duties on the manufactured articles. (3) If the purpose is to extend our markets in Canada, the way to do this is not to secure the removal or the reduction of the Canadian duties on such goods only as Canada expects to sell to us, but to secure the removal of such duties on goods that we export to Canada or might expect to export to Canada if the duties were removed.

It appears to me that the truth of these statements ought to be clearly evident to anyone who will attempt to view the measure with unbiased eyes. If for some reason or other—if the producers of any product have formed a trust or combination so as to unduly enhance prices, or if our production falls short of our consumption, and the tariff on the product consequently results in higher prices, and we wish to reduce these prices by removing the tariff, it seems self-evident that the effective way to do this is to remove the tariff on the goods of all foreign countries and not only on the goods of one. Otherwise, we simply give the producer in the favored foreign country the benefit of our protection—letting him share our home market—in short, give him a measure of protection against the producers in other foreign countries. If the wheat growers of this country have formed a trust and raised the price of wheat beyond what it ought to be, or if our production falls short of our consumption so that the tariff on wheat results in increased prices, and we decide to reduce the price by admitting foreign wheat, the proper way to do, if we have no other purpose in mind, is to remove the duty on wheat, no matter from what country or part of the world it comes. If we admit wheat from one country and exclude that from other countries, we are giving protection to the producers of the first country. The same necessarily holds true in the case of flax, of barley, of oats, of cattle, of pulp and paper, and of any other product. The only ground on which the admission of certain articles free from one country and not from another can be defended is that by so doing we receive in return some advantage from the former country that we do not from the latter. If Canada has given us any such advantages in the pending agreement, no one seems willing or able to point them out.

If the purpose is to reduce the price of the articles that the average consumer uses, not only should the duties be removed on articles from all countries instead of merely from one, but the duties to be removed or greatly reduced should be those on the articles which the consumer buys—not the duties on the natural products, but the goods manufactured from them. So long as the duty remains on the manufactured article, it makes no difference to the consumer whether there is a duty

on the raw material. If the price of wheat falls off 10 cents a bushel because of this agreement it will not affect the price of flour or of the bread made from the flour. If the price of flax is reduced 25 cents per bushel by the removal of the duty, it will not affect the price of linseed oil. Even if the price of oats tumbles on account of the duty being taken off, the price of rolled oats will remain the same so long as the duty is not removed from that. If the price of cattle is reduced the full amount of the present duty the price of beef will remain the same so long as the Beef Trust is protected in its market. Whatever reduction there may be in the price of wheat, of oats, of barley, of flax, or of any of the other farm products and raw materials that this measure places on the free list, the consumer will not get the benefit of lower prices on articles manufactured from these.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; with pleasure.

Mr. STONE. The Senator from North Dakota has expressed the view that if you remove the duty on wheat and retain the duty on flour the flour will not be reduced in price to the consumer.

Mr. GRONNA. That is my position.

Mr. STONE. And that if you remove the duty on cattle and let the duty on beef remain it will not reduce the cost of meat to the consumer.

Mr. GRONNA. That is correct.

Mr. STONE. I wish now to ask whether the Senator thinks that the removal of the duty on flour as well as the duty on wheat would be helpful or hurtful to the wheat raiser; and also to ask him whether he thinks that if we take the duty off cattle so that they may come in free from Canada or free from all the world, and then take the duty off meats so as to let meat come in free, would the effect be to increase or decrease the price of live cattle?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri asked me two questions.

Mr. STONE. Confine it to the last.

Mr. GRONNA. I will attempt to answer both, briefly. The first question is, If we take the duty off, we will say, the raw material, the wheat, which is the product of the farmer, or from cattle, and also remove the duty from the secondary products, will that reduce the price to the consumer? To that I answer yes; I believe it will. The second question, if I understand the Senator correctly, is, If we take the duty off the raw material and retain it on the secondary products, will that reduce the price to the consumer? I say no; and I want to cite one instance, Mr. President, which is worth a great deal more than my opinion.

During the Sixty-first Congress we can all remember the interest that was taken by the Members in both branches of Congress in the question of hides. When the duty was taken off hides green salted hides were worth in the Chicago market from 16½ to 18 cents per pound. It had been said that taking the duty off hides would not affect the price of hides, and it is true that it did not for a few months; it is true that during the next fall hides sold, if anything, a little higher in the Chicago market than they did before the duty was removed; but to-day the price of hides is from 10 to 13 cents a pound, and there is not a Senator on this floor nor a consumer in this Capital but knows that the price of shoes has been advanced to the consumer.

While I am not going to set up my own opinion, if I had time I could prove to the satisfaction of every Senator here that the price on all grades of shoes has advanced on an average about 10 per cent, and in some cases, on the higher grades, it has advanced 12½ per cent. Is that an answer to the Senator?

Mr. STONE. I fear I did not make myself understood by the Senator. I will ask this direct question—

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I am afraid that he does not appreciate and understand the effect of the statement that was made to him by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. STONE. Oh, I think I do understand and appreciate it. As to the hide and shoe business, if the Senator will permit me—

Mr. GRONNA. Certainly, I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. STONE. I will say that during the consideration of the Payne-Aldrich bill I was opposed to putting hides on the free list unless we also put shoes on the free list.

Mr. GRONNA. In that the Senator from Missouri showed his usual good sense and judgment.

Mr. STONE. I advocated both; and if my distinguished friend from Minnesota would consider it of sufficient interest,

which of course he will not and should not, to examine the Record of that time, he would find that I offered an amendment to put shoes on the free list, and that I voted against putting hides on the free list unless shoes were put on the free list. I never believed that putting hides on the free list would result in cheapening shoes to the consumers. I agree with the Senator from North Dakota that it has not done so. I can have no controversy with the Senator from North Dakota or the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] about that. It was very easy for me to appreciate the statement made by the Senator from North Dakota, to which the Senator from Minnesota has called my attention.

I wish to ask this direct question: Does the Senator from North Dakota favor putting meats on the free list?

Mr. GRONNA. Most assuredly, if we place cattle on the free list. If we allow the importation of cattle without any duty, I would certainly favor placing meats on the free list.

Mr. STONE. If this reciprocity bill is agreed to by the Senate as it passed the House, would the Senator from North Dakota vote to put meats on the free list for the whole world?

Mr. GRONNA. I would be willing to do more than that. I would be willing to pass the free-list bill first, as suggested by my distinguished friend and neighbor from Minnesota.

Mr. STONE. But I want, if the Senator will consent—

Mr. GRONNA. And then pass the woolen bill and then—

Mr. STONE. I am not asking about the free list. I am asking the Senator from North Dakota if he would vote to incorporate a provision in the law, in the event the reciprocity bill is passed, to put meats on the free list?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I am a new Senator—

Mr. STONE. But you are an old Member of Congress.

Mr. GRONNA (continuing). And I have not been in position to get the information that perhaps other Senators have. I think it would be better to wait with all this kind of legislation until we get a report from the Tariff Commission. Then we would have full knowledge of conditions not only in our own country but in all countries, especially Mexico, as the Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS] suggests to me.

Mr. STONE. I understood the senior Senator from Iowa to argue the other day that it would be dangerous to put meat on the free list for the reason that if that were done the great packing establishments now operating in the United States might transfer their operations in large measure to the Argentine, to Mexico, and other foreign cattle-raising countries, and there purchase the cheaper range cattle raised on the plains of Argentina or Mexico, slaughter them there, employing cheaper labor, and so on and so forth, along the usual line of argument; and then he argued that they could ship that meat in here and dump it in our markets at a price below what meat made of American-raised cattle could be produced and sold for without a loss, and that the effect of that would be to still further depress the price of our native cattle in the hands of our farmers and feeders. If that is true, if the view of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], who is a wise Senator and one who has delved deeply into the mysteries of these questions, is right, then is it not true, as contended by the Senator from Iowa, that the inevitable effect of permitting the introduction of free meat from the world at large would be to cheapen the price of native cattle, for the price of cattle must in a great measure depend upon the price of beef in our market places?

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. GRONNA. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. NELSON. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri—

Mr. STONE. I was asking the Senator from North Dakota a question. I did not purpose to take the witness stand.

Mr. NELSON. Allow me to make a suggestion. What effect would all that the Senator from Missouri has described have on the packers of Kansas City? I wish the Senator would give us some light on that subject.

Mr. STONE. It would have the same effect on the packers of Kansas City that it would have upon the packers of any other city.

Mr. NELSON. Well, what would be the effect?

Mr. STONE. I was not undertaking to state effects. I was undertaking, for the benefit of my friend from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA], who is insuring alongside of my friend the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], to state the view, as I understand it, of the Senator from Iowa, and to ascertain whether they were agreed.

Now, of course, if cattle bought on the plains of Argentina at a lower price than they can be brought from the ranges of the United States or from the feed lots of the United States, and can be turned into beef down there at a lower price than the cattle here can be turned into beef, and can then be shipped at

a comparatively small expense to our ports and from thence distributed, it does strike me that it would tend to decrease the price of beef to the consumer in the United States, and that in turn might reduce the price of cattle.

Mr. NELSON rose.

Mr. STONE. If you decrease the price of beef in the United States, it strikes me, as it does the Senator from Iowa, that it might decrease the price of cattle in the feed lot.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me?

Mr. STONE. I was asking the Senator from North Dakota if he thinks as the Senator from Iowa thinks about this, and I wanted to know if he was in favor of putting beef on the free list?

Mr. NELSON. I should like to know what remedy the Senator from Missouri would prescribe. Has he any specific that would cure such a situation as he describes?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. GRONNA. With pleasure.

Mr. CUMMINS. Before the Senator from North Dakota answers the very discriminating inquiry propounded by the Senator from Missouri, I should like him to take my position from me rather than from the memory of our distinguished friend, the Senator from Missouri, although he is not far wrong.

Notwithstanding this alliance between the free-trade Senator from Missouri—

Mr. STONE. No; do not put it that way.

Mr. CUMMINS. I mean the tariff-for-revenue-only Senator from Missouri and the high protectionists of New England and Pennsylvania and New York; I am still a protectionist. I still believe in the soundness and universality, for that matter, of the general doctrine of protection. It is said, and it may be true—I am not disposed to controvert it at this time—that there is no substantial difference between the cost of producing cattle in Canada and in the United States.

If there is no such difference, then under the doctrine of protection there ought to be no duty on cattle imported from Canada into the United States. I am not saying whether there is or is not a difference, because we have not made the investigation which is necessary to reach a certain conclusion upon the subject. But—

Mr. STONE. But the Tariff Board has.

Mr. CUMMINS. I beg the Senator's pardon. The Tariff Board has reported some facts with regard to the business, but has not made that complete return which we have a right to expect and which we can fairly expect in the near future. But if the cattle raised in Canada come in free to the United States it goes without saying—no one ought to controvert the proposition—that the meat made from those cattle shall come into the United States free. The man who would deny that proposition has lost all his power of reasoning.

Now, so far as South America is concerned, I want the Senator from Missouri to remember that the conditions of cattle raising in, say, the Argentine Republic are widely different from the conditions of cattle raising in the United States, and everyone who knows anything about that knows that it costs less to produce a steer in the Argentine than it does in the United States.

If we should open the markets of this country to either the cattle or the meat of the Argentine Republic and surrounding countries, we would only be intensifying and emphasizing the wrong that we are about to perpetrate upon the farmers of this country in the reciprocity measure, and so I do not want to be misunderstood at all. So far as I am concerned, I am opposed to free meat from the Argentine Republic. I am opposed to it because that policy would still further reduce the price of cattle in the United States. But I am in favor of free meat from Canada because we are apparently about to admit cattle from Canada upon the hypothesis that it costs no more to produce cattle here than it does there. And with that statement of my position I turn the question and the subject over to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. STONE. I think I fairly stated the position of the Senator from Iowa and substantially as he has stated it himself. Now I again ask my friend the Senator from North Dakota if he concurs in the view of the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Missouri puts to me a hypothetical question. I will ask the Senator from Missouri if he believes that the farmers of Missouri and the United States are receiving too high a price for their cattle or for their meat?

Mr. STONE. No; I do not think they are. I wish they were getting more. But that does not at all touch the question.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I shall not undertake to make any answer for the distinguished Senator from Iowa. I wish I were as able to take care of myself as he is. I can not give the Senator from Missouri a direct answer, because, as I said before, we have had no report from the Tariff Commission that would justify me in saying that I would be in favor of letting in free meat from Mexico. I will say that I believe, as the Senator from Iowa has said, that it might be the means of reducing the price of cattle to the farmers of the United States.

The result of this measure will be that for every bushel of wheat imported the Government will lose the 25 cents which it would have collected otherwise, and for every bushel that the miller buys from the American farmer he will pay as much less as the price is reduced by the free importation of Canadian wheat. For every bushel of barley imported the Government will lose the 30-cent duty, and that bushel will aid the brewing interests in getting the barley of the American farmer for a less price. For every bushel of flax imported the Government will fail to collect the present duty of 25 cents per bushel, and the linseed oil trust will pay less to the American farmer for every bushel of flax that it buys from him. The trusts are still protected in their markets; it is the farmers who are to receive less for their products in order that this administration may have the glory of being the one to negotiate a trade agreement with Canada and force its ratification by Congress.

As an illustration of what result may be expected from removing the duties on raw materials while retaining them on the products manufactured from them, I wish to remind you of what happened when the duty was removed from hides. I touched upon that a moment ago.

Those of us who were in Congress at that time remember the plea of the shoe manufacturers and the tanners for free hides. According to them, if free hides were given them, the result would be lower prices for shoes. Hides were after a struggle placed on the free list, but the price of shoes went up and has stayed up. It has been stated that this was due to an increase of the price of hides—in spite of the removal of the duty—caused by an increased demand for hides in other countries. The fact is, however, that the price of hides has dropped.

In June, 1909, the Chicago prices of hides ranged from 13½ to 17 cents per pound, on the various kinds of hides; in October of the same year they ranged from 14½ to 18 cents, but since then there has been a steady decline, and in March of this year the prices ranged from 10 to 13 cents. The prices of hides have decreased, but the prices of shoes have increased. Whether the benefit of the cheaper hides went to the tanners, the shoe manufacturers, or the trust controlling the machines used by shoe manufacturers, or whether they all shared in it, the fact can not be disputed that the consumer—the person who buys the shoes—not only did not receive any benefit from the removal of the duty on hides, but actually has to pay a higher price for his shoes than he did before. And the Government lost \$2,000,000 revenue, as the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] suggests.

If the purpose of this agreement is to extend the commerce of the United States, or if that is one of the purposes, it would seem that it must have been entered into blindly on the part of our Representatives. Almost without exception the goods on which the duties have been removed are goods that Canada will sell to us and that we can have no hopes of selling to her. I do not see how anyone can maintain that there is any reciprocity in such an agreement. I do not assent to the proposition that the mere mutual removal of duties by two countries constitutes reciprocity. Unless there are mutual benefits there is no reciprocity. It is beyond my comprehension how we can have reciprocity with Canada unless Canada removes the duties from goods that we expect to sell to her in return for our removing the duties on goods which she expects to sell to us.

Mr. President, never before would a measure of this kind have been seriously considered by a Republican President or a Republican Senate. It is not a reciprocity agreement in the true sense of the word, either in form or in nature. It is merely a cloak to hide the adoption of a new economic and industrial policy—a policy that no one connected with the administration has as yet dared to champion in the open, a policy that has never yet been accepted as a Republican policy by anyone authorized to speak for the party and that has never yet found its way into a Republican platform, a policy out of harmony with all the previous declarations of the Republican Party and directly opposed to the tenets held by those who composed its galaxy of statesmen, a policy which will be repudiated by the rank and file of the party as soon as they have an opportunity to be heard—the policy of placing food products and raw materials on the free list and retaining a protective duty on manufactures.

I feel called upon to protest against this false and pernicious doctrine. It is not in accordance with Republican

platform declarations. It was part of the platform on which Mr. Foss was elected governor of Massachusetts, but that was not a Republican platform. Those who favor it must proceed on the assumption that there is no difference in the cost of producing the raw material in the different countries and that its producer is so favorably situated that there is no need of considering what his requirements may be. The only alternative is the less charitable assumption, although I will not say less true in some cases, that those who are so ready to remove the duties on the raw material while advocating the retention of the duties on manufactures—often far in excess of the difference in cost of production at home and abroad—care nothing for any other industries so long as those in which they are especially interested are properly protected. The plea that the farmer has derived no direct benefit from the protective duties on his products in the past, and should therefore not complain if those duties are now removed when it is admitted that he is deriving some benefit or will derive some in the near future, is neither a justification nor an excuse. It is merely an attempt to find a plausible explanation of their willingness to sacrifice the interests of the farmer and producer of raw materials.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to his colleague?

Mr. GRONNA. With pleasure.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think my colleague will agree with me that the use of the term "raw material" as applied to farm products is rather a misnomer. We can scarcely say a product that comes first from an investment of land at \$50 to \$100 an acre, the turning of that land over by the use of power, either horsepower or otherwise, of harrowing it, of purchasing or raising the seed, of sowing it, of caring for that seed, of then harvesting and shocking and thrashing, and finally cleaning and hauling to market is a raw material, and therefore it is the farmers' manufactured material, entitled to the same consideration as any other manufactured product, and should be considered the same in the matter of the levying of our tariff.

Mr. GRONNA. My colleague is absolutely correct in that. I am only using the term "raw material" here in the usual, perhaps rather loose, way. The farmer's bushel of wheat is his finished product; the farmer's wool is his finished product; and everything that is produced on his farm is as much his finished product as a pair of boots is the manufacturer's finished product. There is no question about that.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. GRONNA. I do.

Mr. WARREN. The suggestion in my mind has been given voice by the senior Senator from North Dakota. I assume, and I think correctly, that the junior Senator from North Dakota was using the term in the loose way it is often used. But when we undertake to trace a really true raw material I find it is a good deal of a will-o'-the-wisp, because, taking the matter of farmers' products, they are all the result of an investment of time, labor, and capital. Take, for instance, wool. As stated, that is the finished product of the farmer. It goes to the spinner, and while wool is his raw material the yarn that he turns out is his—the spinner's—finished product. It goes still further to the weaver, the cloth men. The yarn is their raw material in the same sense. The cloth is their manufactured product. Again, it goes to the cutters and the makers of garments. The cloth itself is their raw material and the finished clothing is their manufactured product.

So it is hard to undertake to define anything along the lines of that which is the product of labor as raw material. I assume that the Senator from North Dakota is using the term in the sense in which it is so often used or misused.

Mr. McCUMBER. If the Senator will allow me, I think we can only justly apply the term raw material to the minerals in the ground, which have been placed there by nature, and the trees that grow on the mountains or along the rivers. The moment that human labor is applied to them even those articles become the fixed product of the laborer.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague and also the Senator from Wyoming for calling my attention to this point. I agree with both. What is one man's finished product is another man's raw material, and vice versa. As my colleague has said, raw material is that which has not been touched by the human hand.

The Republican platform of 1908 declares:

In all tariff legislation the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries.

It does not confine it to manufactures, but to American industries.

This platform on which President Taft was elected does not mention reciprocity; neither does the Democratic platform of that year. If the principle above stated is to apply in the making of tariffs, the policy will have to be pursued as regards agriculture as well as manufacturing. If the manufacturer is to have a protective duty equal to the difference in cost of production, so must the farmer. The farmers have loyally supported protection because they believed that it would result in building up the industries of the country, and although most of them realized that they were getting comparatively little in return for the burden they were bearing, they bore the burden uncomplainingly, because they had sufficient patriotism to suffer under temporary—as they believed—disadvantages in order that the general welfare might be promoted. They did expect, however, fair treatment. Believing that it would be wise statesmanship to have a protective tariff sufficient to encourage home industries and protect the home market from the effects of industrial disturbances and undue price fluctuations abroad; believing that a reasonable stability in prices is more advantageous both to the producer and the consumer than violent fluctuations, and consequently believing that our own markets should not be subjected to the disturbances which would be inevitable if thrown open to the whole world so as to feel the combined effects of speculations, panics, misdirected efforts, industrial miscalculations, and in general whatever may disturb production and bring on industrial crises, they were willing to bear these burdens at a time when they derived little benefit from them, in the belief that when the time came when it would be a direct benefit to the farmers to protect them from the flood of produce resulting from the opening of new and fertile lands, that small favor would not be begrudged them. They now see with bitter amazement the readiness with which they are now to be sacrificed, not because of any undue benefits which they have been deriving from protection, not because of their having formed trusts and combinations to raise the prices of their products to exorbitant levels, but apparently because it has been decided that popular discontent with the indefensible duties on certain manufactures demands a victim to appease the popular discontent, and the agricultural interests have been seized upon as the ones who will make the least resistance. Consequently they are called upon to surrender the duties on their products without receiving anything in return, and their protection is to be cut off without any examination as to what the effect of such action will be, and so far as the administration is concerned, without giving the farmers a single word in defense. How different the treatment of the woolen interests, the duties on whose products the President has characterized as indefensible, but which, it is now given out, must not be touched until the Tariff Board has made a thorough investigation, lest a change based on deficient knowledge injure the industry!

I can not forbear to say at this point, Mr. President, that the indifference of the administration to the interests and welfare of the farmer, the unkindly rebuffs he has met with when he has attempted to present his case to the President, and the jeers and innuendos of which he has been made the object by the metropolitan press, especially that portion of it which is supporting the present administration, will not result in any good either for the country or the administration. I do not presume that there is a Senator here who does not know that the opposition to this measure among the farmers is real, and that the farmers who appeared before the Finance Committee of the Senate in opposition to it were here in sincere earnestness because they were convinced of the injustice of the measure and the destructive effects which it will have on agriculture.

This bill places whatever the farmer produces on the free list, and the arguments for it have largely been devoted to stating that this will not injure the farmer in any way, that it will not affect the prices that he receives for his products. Especially in the case of wheat it has been industriously reported that the price is made in Liverpool, and that, consequently, anything that we may do in this matter will have no effect on that price. It is noticeable that those who are industriously making this statement are those who have nothing more than an academic interest in the price of wheat or else have certain interests in the adoption of this measure. The farmer and the grain buyer both seem to be convinced that it will affect the price, and that its effect will be to lower the price. Without exception, so far as I have noticed, all those who have had to do with the handling of grain, whose success or failure has often depended on their ability to judge the market and determine its probable trend, whether it be as buyer or seller, seem to be convinced

that the free admission of Canadian wheat can have but one effect, and that is to lower the price to the American farmer. Those who have to back their opinion with hard cash seem to be satisfied that the effect of removing the duty will be to lower the price. The very day that the Minneapolis wheat traders received the news of the Canadian agreement there was a break in the wheat prices at Minneapolis. In the market reports published by such papers as the Minneapolis Journal, which supports this agreement, this break was ascribed to the belief that the agreement would result in lower prices. Whether that belief be correct or erroneous, there is no getting around the fact that the break in the market and the subsequent lower prices for wheat were due to it.

There are those who, looking at our exports of wheat every year, are unable to comprehend why the removal of the tariff on wheat should have any effect on the price. Most people know that our consumption of wheat is gradually overtaking our production, and that our exports are consequently decreasing. The exports for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1908, 1909, and 1910, were 163,043,669 bushels, 114,268,468 bushels, and 87,364,318 bushels, respectively.

Mr. McCUMBER. I should like to ask my colleague if that does not include flour?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; it includes flour.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wished to make it clear.

Mr. GRONNA. This includes the wheat flour, reduced to bushels at the rate of $4\frac{1}{2}$ bushels to the barrel. The exports for the calendar years 1908, 1909, and 1910 of wheat and wheat flour were 151,338,124 bushels, 92,085,643 bushels, and 61,923,297 bushels, respectively. The 1910 crop of wheat was 695,443,000 bushels. It will thus be seen that the export of wheat and flour during the calendar year 1910 was somewhat less than 9 per cent of the number of bushels raised that year. It would appear to many that this would be sufficient to have the effect of reducing the price in our markets to the level of the Liverpool market, less the cost of transporting the wheat to the latter market. One difficulty with most people in considering this question is that they do not distinguish between the different kinds and grades of wheat, and do not appreciate the different milling qualities of the various grades. Further, many people are apt to pursue the inquiry as to where the wheat goes no further when they learn that it was exported, taking it for granted that every bushel sold abroad has the same effect in tending to reduce the price in our domestic market to the Liverpool price as if sold in Liverpool.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, we exported in all 46,679,876 bushels of wheat. Of this about 20,000,000 bushels went to England. Almost 6,000,000 bushels went to Belgium. Over 5,000,000 bushels went to Germany. Over 3,000,000 bushels went to Mexico. During the same year we exported in all 9,040,987 barrels of flour. Of this, 1,895,397 barrels went to England, 791,850 barrels to Cuba, almost 740,000 barrels to the Netherlands, and almost 669,000 barrels to Hongkong. The rest of the flour and the rest of the wheat was scattered among the other nations of the world. A little reflection will convince anyone that with our wheat and flour distributed in this manner we are more independent of the Liverpool market than we should be if all our surplus went to that market, and the effect of the Liverpool price on our domestic price consequently less marked.

There is another fact, however, which operates even more strongly to make the Minneapolis and Duluth markets independent of the Liverpool market. The three States producing the bulk of the hard spring wheat are Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota. The terminal markets for this wheat are Minneapolis and Duluth. The milling qualities of this wheat are greatly superior to those of the winter varieties, and all, or practically all, of this wheat is ground into flour in this country. The wheat which is exported and which competes with the wheat of other countries in the Liverpool and other foreign markets is either winter wheat or the other variety of wheat called durum, or macaroni wheat, of which varying quantities are grown in the three spring-wheat States. The Secretary of Agriculture makes the following statement in his 1909 report in regard to the production of durum or macaroni wheat:

The annual production of durum wheat at present, though difficult to determine before taking a census, appears to be at least 50,000,000 bushels, and probably comes nearer to 60,000,000. * * * The export now averages considerably over 20,000,000 bushels per annum.

The export of all kinds of wheat for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910—the crop of 1909—was, in round numbers, 47,000,000 bushels. Subtracting the export of durum wheat and there would remain not more, and in all probability considerably less, than 27,000,000 bushels as our export of winter and hard spring

wheat. The supply of durum wheat has not been an appreciable factor in fixing the price of the other kinds of wheat. It is a wheat that is not now to any extent used for flour in this country. Only a few years ago our millers refused absolutely to buy and grind it. Its price has consequently always been below that of hard spring wheat. A few years ago the difference was as much as 20 cents per bushel. At present the difference is about 10 or 11 cents. In considering the effect of the prices at Liverpool on our domestic price, therefore, we must deduct the export of durum wheat from our total wheat export, as this wheat has in the past competed only indirectly with the other kinds of wheat—in much the same manner, for instance, that oats competes with barley. The remaining 27,000,000 bushels, constituting our total export of winter and spring wheat in 1910, was practically all winter wheat. The statement was made before the Finance Committee, and so far as I know it has not been disputed either before the committee or elsewhere, that not only do we not export any spring wheat, but that even the best grades of northwestern flour never go to Europe. Consequently, while the winter wheat, or part of it, is exported to Europe and other countries, and there comes in competition with wheat from all parts of the world, the hard spring wheat of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota does not come into competition with the wheat produced in other countries, and the world price of wheat does not determine the Minneapolis or Duluth price. The price in the Liverpool market has an indirect effect on the price at Minneapolis and Duluth, as it affects the price of our winter wheat, and the winter wheat will to some extent compete with our spring wheat. If the supply of spring wheat is short, or if its price is very much higher than that of winter wheat, for instance, the winter wheat will to some extent take the place of the spring wheat in the manufacture of flour, although the flour thus manufactured will not compare in quality with that made from spring wheat. It is merely a case of accepting the inferior article if the price of the better one is deemed too high.

How nearly independent we are of the Liverpool market is even better brought out if we take the exports of wheat and wheat flour for the calendar year 1910. During that year we exported, in round numbers, 24,000,000 bushels in the form of wheat and 37,000,000 bushels in the form of flour. If the estimate of the Secretary of Agriculture that our export of durum wheat is in excess of 20,000,000 bushels annually holds good, and I see no reason for doubting it, it is apparent that even in the case of spring wheat the effect of the world's market on its price is only indirect, due to the competition of the flour of other countries with our flour in the world's markets. How much of the flour exported was durum wheat flour I have not been able to learn; but it seems probable that some of it may have been. Taking the lowest figures given by the Secretary as to production and export of durum wheat, 50,000,000 bushels and 20,000,000 bushels, respectively, would leave 30,000,000 bushels to be consumed and disposed of otherwise. The requirements for seed would not exceed four or five million bushels, which would leave some 25,000,000 bushels unaccounted for. While all of this may not be ground into flour in this country, a large part of it undoubtedly is, and making allowance for the consumption of some of it in this country, it seems probable to believe that part of the 37,000,000 bushels exported in the form of flour was durum wheat.

The price of wheat in Canada, however, is dependent on the Liverpool price because of the large percentage of the crop which they export. The wheat which they raise in the Canadian northwest is practically all hard spring wheat; and as they consume only part of it, the remainder is exported to be sold in competition with the wheat from other countries. The result is that the price of No. 1 northern in Winnipeg has been on the average some 11 cents less than the Minneapolis and Duluth price. The Winnipeg price is the price of Port Arthur, ready for export; it is the export price. It has been urged that the difference in price is due to the difference in freight charges, but it should be borne in mind that the distance to Liverpool by the Canadian route is some 600 or 700 miles shorter than by the American route. And as wheat can be shipped through the United States in bond without the payment of duty, if the difference in price were due to the higher freight charges in Canada, the Canadian wheat for export would naturally be shipped through the United States in the manner indicated, the effect of which would be to raise the Winnipeg price. As shipping the wheat in bond does not have this effect on the Winnipeg market, and as the price received by the Canadian farmer for wheat to be shipped in bond through the United States is from 10 to 15 cents less than that received by the American farmer within 4 or 5 miles, or sometimes less, of the same point, it is evident that the difference in price is not due to the difference in freight charges.

An attempt was made to show before the Finance Committee that the difference was due to laws enacted in Canada, prohibiting the trading in futures or hedging, and that this restriction on the grain trading at Winnipeg had resulted in depressing the price below the Minneapolis level. The Winnipeg Grain Exchange, however, has denied that there is any law preventing hedging, and has stated that country elevators sell daily purchases as hedge as regular thing, and that the exchange floor business at Winnipeg is practically the same as at Minneapolis. I do not see there can be any escape from the conclusion that the higher price for hard spring wheat in our markets is due to the fact that our markets are independent of the Liverpool market and the tariff on wheat prevents the importation of wheat from Canada. Lest anyone should think that perhaps the Canadian wheat is an inferior product, I will say that No. 1 northern wheat in Canada must weigh 60 pounds to the bushel, while No. 1 northern wheat in the markets in this country is not required to weigh more than 58 pounds to the bushel. It consequently takes better wheat to grade No. 1 northern in Canada than it does in the United States.

In order to secure definite information as to what the difference actually is between the price received by the American farmer for wheat and that received by the Canadian farmer, I wrote to Mr. George McLean, a grain dealer at Sarles, N. Dak. Besides buying American wheat, Mr. McLean buys Canadian wheat in bond. In buying Canadian wheat he has the competition of the Canadian wheat buyers in the neighboring Canadian towns, and, of course, has to pay at least the full price that the Canadian buyers do, and possibly a little more, as in all probability the Canadian farmer has to haul his grain a little farther in order to sell it to Mr. McLean than he has to in order to reach his Canadian markets. Sarles is located some 3 or 4 miles south of the Canadian boundary. North of the boundary line are the towns of Cartwright, Clearwater, and Crystal City—none of them more than 10 miles from the line. These towns are situated in the Province of Manitoba, on a branch of the Canadian Pacific Railroad, within 100 miles of the great city of Winnipeg. I wish to insert here, and have made a part of my remarks, Mr. McLean's reply, which gives the prices paid for American and Canadian wheat at Sarles during the months of October and November last:

SARLES, N. DAK., May 27, 1911.

Hon. A. J. GRONNA,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. GRONNA: Replying to your letter of the 23d instant regarding the prices paid for wheat in Sarles, I submit the following:

| Dates. | American wheat. | Canadian wheat in bond. |
|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| Oct. 3, 1910..... | \$0.97 | \$0.85 |
| Oct. 5, 1910..... | .98 | .84 |
| Oct. 7, 1910..... | 1.00 | .85 |
| Oct. 11, 1910..... | .99 | .85 |
| Oct. 12, 1910..... | .98 | .83 |
| Oct. 15, 1910..... | .96 | .83 |
| Oct. 17, 1910..... | .95 | .81 |
| Oct. 20, 1910..... | .93 | .81 |
| Oct. 25, 1910..... | .91 | .81 |
| Oct. 29, 1910..... | .92 | .79 |
| Nov. 1, 1910..... | .89 | .77 |
| Nov. 2, 1910..... | .90 | .75 |
| Nov. 3, 1910..... | .89 | .75 |
| Nov. 4, 1910..... | .88 | .75 |
| Nov. 8, 1910..... | .89 | .77 |
| Nov. 12, 1910..... | .88 | .77 |
| Nov. 14, 1910..... | .91 | .79 |
| Nov. 16, 1910..... | .93 | .79 |
| Nov. 20, 1910..... | .92 | .80 |
| Nov. 26, 1910..... | .91 | .80 |
| Dec. 2, 1910..... | .91 | .77 |

Mr. Gronna, these are actual prices paid on the above dates and can be verified if necessary.

Yours, very respectfully,

GEORGE MCLEAN.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to state to my colleague that the Canadian wheat is purchased and sold in bond, so that no tariff has to be paid on it.

Mr. GRONNA. Certainly; no tariff at all has to be paid. I shall touch upon that point in a few moments.

The difference in price at Sarles in favor of the American market ranges from 10 to 15 cents, and averages just a little less than 13 cents during the two months for which the prices are given. Is it any wonder that the Canadian farmer is anxious to enter the American markets with his wheat when he sees his neighbor right across the boundary line—only a few miles distant, their fields perhaps touching—receive on the average 13 cents more for every bushel of wheat that he sells? And is it any wonder that the American farmer is opposed to an agreement which will permit the Canadians to sell their

surplus in the markets of this country, and which everyone expects will result in bringing the markets in the two countries to the same level?

The free admission of Canadian wheat in competition with our hard spring wheat can have no other effect than bringing the markets for this kind of wheat in the two countries to the same level. Whether the immediate result would be to reduce the American market to the present level of the Canadian market, or whether the Canadian price would be increased somewhat, I shall not undertake to say. In view of the large surplus which Canada even now has, however, I am inclined to believe that the price of wheat would rise little in Canada, if at all. There would be a decided decline in the price on this side of the line. Of the ultimate result there can be little doubt. Canada has such vast possibilities before her as a wheat-raising country that only a very few years would be required until her production of the hard varieties of wheat would far exceed the combined consumption of the two countries, and the price received for the surplus exported and sold in the world's markets would determine the price received by the American as well as the Canadian farmers.

Another effect which the free admission of Canadian wheat would have, distinct from that above noted, which may not be apparent to one who is not conversant with actual conditions, is the effect of dumping a large supply of wheat into the terminal markets in the fall. The Canadian Northwest is a new country. In new wheat-growing countries the grain is sold practically from the thrashing machine. The new settler needs money to pay the bills contracted during the year, which are payable as soon as he has thrashed his wheat, and hurries his grain to the market as soon as it reaches him from the spout of the thrashing machine. The result is that most of the wheat is marketed at practically the same time, and the markets are glutted. The unusually heavy receipts invariably result in unduly low prices, and the farmer who is compelled to sell in the same market at that time receives less for his wheat than it is actually worth. In sections that have been longer settled the grain is marketed more gradually and the prices are more stable. If Canadian wheat is admitted free there can be no doubt that the millions of bushels of wheat produced in that new country will come pouring over the border in the fall of the year and glut the Minneapolis and Duluth markets to the further injury of the American wheat grower.

The President has stated at various times that conditions of production are so similar on the two sides of the boundary line that it is evident that the Canadian farmers have no advantage over ours, and that consequently the Republican platform, which declares for a tariff sufficient to cover the difference in cost of production at home and abroad, is not violated by this agreement. As a matter of fact the conditions are not similar. The mere fact that wages may be the same per day, and that there may not be much difference in the cost of living, does not make the conditions of producing grain similar. Other things have to be taken into consideration. Old land will require more cultivation to produce a crop than new land, and may require the use of fertilizers. With the same cultivation the new land will produce a crop much greater than the old land, and the labor cost per unit of production on the old land may be several times that on the new land, even though the daily wages paid may be exactly the same. Further, land in an old settled section will cost more than new land in a country just opening up. Now, Canada has the new, cheaper, more productive lands, and we have the older, less productive, dearer lands. It would seem that no argument would be needed to convince anyone that with these conditions the cost of raising a bushel of wheat is necessarily greater in the United States than in Canada, and yet the statement is gravely made and reiterated whenever an attempt is made to show that the farmer has no right to complain because of this measure.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRANDEGEE in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. GRONNA. With pleasure.

Mr. CLAPP. I take it that the Senator is about to leave that particular question; and, if so, I desire to make a suggestion at that point.

Mr. GRONNA. I will be very glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. CLAPP. The question of the balance of trade in non-competitive articles, of course, simply means that one country must buy noncompetitive articles somewhere. If they buy them all of one country, it means nothing as to competition, but the balance of trade in competitive articles means something as to the ability of a country to compete. According to the President's own figures, the balance of trade for the year ending the

1st of July, 1910, I think, in favor of the United States was \$119,000,000, but to get that balance of trade the United States had to sell enough additional in Canada to make up a balance of trade against us in agricultural products; in other words, take the articles which this bill advances to the free list—and I use the word "advances" advisably, for corn is already on the free list and of course we have a balance of trade on corn.

Mr. GRONNA. And the same is true of cotton.

Mr. CLAPP. Yes; but take the articles which this bill advances to the free list, consisting principally of farm products, and in those articles for that year Canada had a balance of trade against us of \$22,000,000. There is a concrete fact of more value, it seems to me, than all the disputes by the day as to whether a man gets \$1.13 or \$1.12 in one country or the other. In this balancing of competitive articles the balance was against us \$22,000,000, which shows beyond any controversy that we simply can not compete with Canada upon those articles, and yet those are the articles it is proposed to advance to the free list.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the Senator is absolutely correct in that statement, according to my view. The agreement will not only be detrimental to the farmer in that it will depress his prices, but it will be detrimental to the country as a whole.

Mr. COLLINS, testifying before the Senate Finance Committee, gives the cost of raising a bushel of wheat in Minnesota and the two Dakotas as 65 cents per bushel, and in Saskatchewan as 39 cents per bushel. The cost, according to these figures, is 26 cents less in Saskatchewan. Mr. Chamberlain, testifying before the same committee, arrives at a cost of 57 cents per bushel in the United States and 40 cents per bushel in Canada—a difference of 17 cents per bushel in favor of the Canadian farmer. Mr. Chamberlain does not seem to have taken into account, however, the higher price of land in the United States—as he takes \$8 as the cost per acre of raising wheat in both countries—which would operate to make the difference in cost per bushel greater than that given by him. Mr. Thomas H. Cooper, of the State University of Minnesota, submitted to the Select Committee on Wages and Prices of Commodities a statement showing that the average cost of production on a number of farms, records for which for a series of years have been kept at the university, was as follows for the years 1908 and 1909: Wheat, 75 cents per bushel; oats, 38.3 cents per bushel; corn, 41.2 cents per bushel; barley, 40.9 cents per bushel; flax, 1.037 per bushel; potatoes, 30 cents per bushel. I believe that these figures more nearly represent the actual cost of the above-named farm products than those of Mr. Collins and Mr. Chamberlain. I have had figures submitted to me, however, by actual farmers in North Dakota showing a much higher cost of production than those of Mr. Cooper. Without expressing any opinion as to what the exact cost of raising a bushel of wheat may be, I will say that I do not see how anyone who has taken the trouble to inquire as to the yield in the Canadian Northwest and the yields in our wheat-producing States and the prices of lands in the two countries, can make the statement that it costs no more to produce a bushel of wheat in the United States than it does in Canada. The average yield of the Canadian wheat fields in 1909 was 21½ bushels per acre. The average yield of the United States the same year was 15.8 bushels per acre. The yield in Minnesota was 16.8 bushels; in North Dakota, 13.7; in South Dakota, 14.1. The average yield in the United States in 1910 was 14.1 bushels. In Minnesota the yield was 16 bushels; in South Dakota, 12.8 bushels; in North Dakota, 5 bushels. The yield in Canada was also somewhat less than the year before, the total wheat crop being some 17,000,000 bushels less, while the acreage was greater.

I have spent considerable time on the question of how this measure will affect the price of wheat, because wheat is the great staple production of my State. The prosperity of the farmers of North Dakota depends on the wheat crop and the price received for that crop. Last year there was a short crop because of drought, and it seems an act of wanton cruelty to inflict this measure on the farmers of that section, when they will need every dollar they can possibly receive for their grain in order to recover from the setback received last year.

In the case of barley the measure will not affect the North Dakota farmer as much as it will the farmers of other States. When we come to flax, however, the blow again strikes the farmers of my State. North Dakota usually produces about three-fifths of all the flax raised in this country. The annual production of flax in the United States is usually about 25,000,000 bushels. Practically all of this is consumed in the United States. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909, we exported 882,889 bushels, and in the year ending June 30, 1910, only 65,193 bushels. This year considerable quantities will have

to be imported, as last year's production was only slightly more than 14,000,000 bushels. The price in this country is consequently not dependent on the markets in other countries. And yet it is contended that removing this duty will not in any way affect the farmer. The production of flax in Canada is increasing, the acreage in 1910 being more than three times that in 1909. The average yield of flax in the United States was 9.4 bushels in 1909; in 1910 it was 4.8 bushels. In Canada the average yields for the same years were 15.98 bushels and 7.97 bushels, respectively. With the free admission of Canadian flax it will inevitably result in lowering the price of flax in this country. And it is to be noted in the case of flax, as in that of wheat, that the removal of the tariff will not result in decreasing the cost to the consumer as the tariff is still retained on linseed oil. The more a person studies this measure the more is he impressed with the care which has been taken to retain the duties on manufactures, while removing it on raw materials. I will say that by "raw materials" I mean the products of the farmer, which, of course, as my colleague [Mr. McCUMBER] suggests to me, are not raw materials, but the farmers' finished products.

Some supporters of this measure are wont to speak of Canadians in farm products as negligible, and refer to the exports of Canadian wheat, for instance, as unimportant. While I do not like to advertise the advantages of a foreign country as compared with our own, I feel it incumbent upon me to call attention to some of the facts with regard to Canada. West of the Red River of the North, and stretching northward from the boundary of the United States, lies the great Canadian Northwest. Stretching 1,000 miles from Winnipeg to the Rockies, and 500 miles northward from the boundary, she has what is claimed to be the largest unbroken wheat field in the world. The area of the three prairie Provinces, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta is equal to the combined areas of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Missouri. The future wheat production of this region is estimated at from 1,000,000,000 to 1,600,000,000 bushels, or from one and a half to two and a half times the present production of the United States; and yet it is said that the enactment of the reciprocity bill will not affect the American farmer. In 1909 Saskatchewan alone, with 50,000,000 of her 60,000,000 acres of arable land unbroken prairies, produced 91,000,000 bushels of wheat. In addition to that she produced more than 105,000,000 bushels of oats, almost 8,000,000 bushels of barley, and nearly 4,500,000 bushels of flax. Alberta has 100,000,000 acres of agricultural land, with only 1,000,000 at present under cultivation. Manitoba is the oldest of the three Provinces, but it is estimated that only 20 per cent of her arable land is under cultivation.

During the year ending March 31, 1910, 208,794 immigrants entered Canada, 103,798 of whom came from the United States. It does not require a prophet to see what the effect on wheat raising in the United States will be of the free admission of Canadian grain. In two or three years Canada will export more wheat and flour than we do. If we admit her wheat free, not only will it compete with our hard spring wheat and force the price down to the level of the world's market, but it will displace a large part of the winter wheat which is now mixed with the northwestern hard wheat for milling purposes, and the States producing winter wheat will be compelled to find a market for most of their product abroad, instead of exporting only the surplus as at present. It should be further noted in this connection—and I ask the Senate to pay particular attention to this—that with the tariff removed from wheat the American wheat grower is in danger of being discriminated against in the matter of freight rates. The American railroads will be sure of the carrying of the American grain, but for the carrying of the Canadian grain they will have to compete with the Canadian lines, the inevitable result of which would seem to be lower rates for Canadian producers than for American producers. The American farmers being at noncompetitive points will have to help pay the cost of carrying the grain of the Canadian farmers located at competitive points. There can be no question about that, Mr. President.

President Taft made a speech at Chicago on the 3d of June in which he undertook to defend this agreement. In connection with his discussion of the effects of the measure on agriculture, he makes the following statement:

Canada is so far north that her agricultural products are practically limited to wheat, rye, barley, oats, potatoes, live cattle, horses, and dairy products.

He might have added to the above flax and hay, and he would have no difficulty in finding a number of States on this side of the line whose agricultural products are limited to those enumerated. He dwells upon the fact that Canada produces no cotton and little corn as a reason why this measure will not

injure the farmer. It would seem that it was hardly necessary to call attention to the fact that Canada will not be a competitor in the production of cotton and corn. She does produce the products enumerated above, and when we admit these free of duty they must inevitably compete with our products. The reason that Canada entered into this agreement was that she wanted a better market for these products, and she expects to find it in this country. Canada had no duty on either cotton or corn, and we had no duty on cotton. The removal of the duty on corn is not going to affect the price of either of those products in any way, and I do not know that anyone has maintained that it will. The crops which the different Provinces of Canada produce, however, are the crops that our border States across the line from those Provinces produce, and whether we like to admit it or not, it can not be denied that the Canadian products will compete with ours in our own markets.

The President continues:

She (Canada) imports a large amount of cottonseed oil, which, by the Canadian reciprocity treaty, is now made free; she can not fatten cattle as they are fattened in the United States, and therefore it has become very profitable for American farmers to import young cattle from Canada even with the duty on them and to fatten them for the Chicago market.

Now, mark this—

The United States imports into Canada a great many more horses than she exports from the Canadians. She sends to Canada a much larger amount of potatoes than she receives from her. The United States imports into Canada about 15 times as much of meat and dairy products as Canada imports into the United States.

Mr. President, I deny that statement, or at least a part of it.

The President apparently expects the farmer to derive some benefit from the free admission of cottonseed oil by Canada, but as the farmer does not manufacture cottonseed oil, I believe it must be conceded that if any benefit is derived it will not be by the farmer. So far as the statement that it has become very profitable for the American farmers to import Canadian cattle, even with the duty on them and to fatten them for the Chicago market, is concerned, I have been unable to find anything that would in any way warrant such an assertion. The number of cattle imported from Canada, on which duty was paid, during the fiscal year 1909, was 10,061. In 1910 the number was 5,168. The receipts of cattle at our principal markets are somewhat more than 9,000,000 a year. Whatever may be the result of the removal of the duty on cattle, it is apparent that there is not now any such industry as the importation of Canadian cattle for the purpose of fattening them for the Chicago market, as the President seems to have been led to believe. Farmers appearing before the Finance Committee flatly contradicted the statement that Canadian cattle were imported for this purpose. If it were a fact that the Canadian farmers can raise cattle so much cheaper than the Americans that cattle can profitably be imported under the present duty, it would appear an argument for increasing the duty rather than removing it, if the farmer is to be treated as other producers are in the matter of tariff legislation. The present tariff, however, appears to be fully protective. The total number of cattle of all kinds in the United States is, in round numbers, 70,000,000. The total number in Canada is 7,000,000. The result of the removal of the duty would no doubt be an increasing import of cattle from Canada, resulting in lower prices for our cattle raisers, cheaper cattle for the packers, and no reduction in the price of meat paid by the consumer.

The statement that we send to Canada a much larger amount of potatoes than we receive from her is not quite exact. The imports from and exports to Canada of potatoes for the last five years are as follows:

| Years. | Imports from Canada. | Exports to Canada. |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| | <i>Bushels.</i> | <i>Bushels.</i> |
| 1906 | 421,106 | 171,010 |
| 1907 | 11,393 | 136,360 |
| 1908 | 177,102 | 169,029 |
| 1909 | 1,181,693 | 107,425 |
| 1910 | 97,138 | 207,764 |
| Total | 1,888,421 | 791,588 |

Our total imports of potatoes from Canada for the last five years are 1,888,421 bushels, and our exports to Canada 791,588 bushels. So we do not export as many potatoes to Canada as we import from that country. These figures are taken from Commerce and Navigation of the United States for the year 1910, and are presumably correct.

The President's statement that we export fifteen times as much meat and dairy products to Canada as we import from

Canada is in danger of being misleading, so far as dairy products are concerned. In the fiscal year 1910 we exported to Canada dairy products to the value of \$86,230, while we imported dairy products to the value of \$831,378. Our imports of these products were almost ten times as great as our exports. These imports came into our country in spite of our duties of 6 cents a pound on butter and cheese, 2 cents a gallon on milk, and 5 cents a gallon on cream. The removal of the duties on these products will, of course, result in a greatly increased importation, with the usual result on the prices received by our dairy farmers.

Now, I want my friend from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] to pay particular attention, inasmuch as he is a farmer. So far as meat products are concerned the President is correct in the statement that we export to Canada far more than we import from Canada, but the farmer does not export and sell these products, and the duties on them have not been removed. The Beef Trust sells the meat products, and it will still have the benefit of a high protective duty.

The President says further:

The only real importation of agricultural products that we may expect from Canada of any considerable amount will consist of wheat, barley, rye, and oats. The world price of these four cereals is fixed abroad, where the surplus from the producing countries is disposed of, and is little affected by the place from which the supply is derived. Canadian wheat nets, perhaps, 10 cents less a bushel to the producer than what grows in the Dakotas or in Minnesota—

Now, mark this. The President admits that the Canadian farmers receive 10 cents a bushel less, and then he gives the reason or attempts to do so—

due to the fact that exporting that wheat and warehousing it and transporting it to Liverpool is considerably greater than the cost to the Dakota farmer of disposing of his wheat to the millers of Minneapolis or sending it abroad.

Besides the agricultural products mentioned by the President Canada will also send us cattle, sheep, potatoes, hay, dairy products, and flaxseed. Consul Frank Deedmeyer, Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, makes the following interesting report as to what that small island has now available for export to the United States in the event of the passage of this measure:

There are now available in Prince Edward Island for shipment to the United States, if freed from tariff duties, 100,000 bushels of potatoes, 500,000 bushels of turnips and other roots, 2,000,000 bushels of oats, 100,000 bushels of seed oats, 150,000 tons of hay, 600,000 pounds of cheese, 100,000 pounds of butter, 1,000,000 dozen eggs.

The President makes the bald statement that the difference in the price of wheat received by the North Dakota farmer and that received by the Canadian farmer is due to the greater cost of "exporting that wheat and warehousing it and transporting it to Liverpool." I do not happen to have any figures at hand as to the transportation charges from Port Arthur to Liverpool and from Duluth to Liverpool, but it was stated before the Finance Committee, and I am sure my colleague will bear me out in the statement that they are the same. If the difference in price were due to the greater cost of transporting the Canadian wheat to Liverpool, the difference in price ought to be, approximately, equal to the difference in cost of transportation. Now, even if the Canadian transportation system were so much inferior to ours that it cost the Canadian exporter 10 cents more to ship a bushel of wheat to Liverpool than it costs the American exporter, as the President would have us believe, the Canadian has the very simple alternative of shipping his wheat in bond—of taking advantage of our superior transportation facilities and shipping his grain through the United States without paying any duty. As he sells his grain for 10 cents less than his American cousin receives and does not ship his wheat in bond—or if he does does it not result in his receiving the same price—there surely must be some other reason for this difference.

The President continues:

If, now, the duty is to be taken off of wheat and the Canadian wheat can come to the millers of Minneapolis and other places, it can and will be made into flour, because the capacity of the American mills is 33 per cent greater than is needed to mill the wheat of this country.

I am quoting from the President's speech—

Canadian wheat can be imported and ground into flour without materially reducing the demand for or price of American wheat, and the surplus will be sent abroad as flour. The price of Canadian wheat will doubtless be increased a few cents by access to the market nearer at hand, but the access to the market nearer at hand will not reduce the price of his wheat to the American farmer, for the reasons stated.

If, as the President says, the capacity of the American mills is 33 per cent greater than the production of American wheat, why is it that we every year export more wheat as wheat than in the form of flour? Why should not these American mills find work in the grinding of American wheat instead of Canadian wheat? If the reason that more American wheat is not exported as flour is that the European countries discriminate

against our flour in favor of our wheat, would not that same cause operate as against grinding Canadian wheat, proceeding on the assumption that the President's premises are correct? And further, if there are other reasons, not apparent, which prevent the American mills from grinding their full capacity of American wheat, why do not those mills now grind Canadian wheat in bond or under the drawback privilege? The mills can import Canadian wheat, under the present law, and grind it, and if they export the flour and by-products they are refunded 99 per cent of the duty paid, in other words they are required to pay a duty of only one-fourth cent per bushel. If it is not profitable to do this and export the flour now, will it be profitable to grind Canadian wheat for export if the duty is removed? And if, as seems the inevitable conclusion, that flour will not be exported, how can we escape from the conclusion that the flour made from Canadian wheat will displace an equal amount of flour made from American wheat?

The President continues in his enumeration of the benefits to be derived by the American farmer:

A very material benefit to all the farmers of the country, especially the stock and cattle raisers and the dairy farmers, will be the by-products of bran and shorts from the flour mills likely to follow the free export of wheat from Canada to those mills. These by-products are now so scarce and so high priced that many farmers are unable to procure them.

Will any Senator here tell me how the farmer is going to buy his bran and shorts any cheaper with a duty of 12½ cents per hundred or \$2.50 per ton?

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. CLAPP. Of course he could not get it any cheaper, but he could have some consolation possibly—that is, if he could follow some people's theory, the evident theory of the authors of this bill—in the thought that the wheat which had been made from it had been put on the free list. That would be about all the consolation he would get out of it.

Mr. GRONNA. That is correct.

If the price of bran and shorts is so high now that many farmers are unable to procure them, as the President states, the simple and effective way to remedy this would be to place these by-products on the free list.

I believe my farmer friend the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] will agree with me on that.

This measure retains a duty of 12½ cents per 100 pounds. If, as there is reason to believe, the free admission of wheat will merely give the millers cheaper wheat, and permit them to grind Canadian wheat instead of American wheat, without materially increasing the amount of wheat ground, there will be no increase of the supply of bran and shorts and their price will not be lowered. The removal of the duty on the raw material is not an effective way of reducing the price of either the manufactured product or the by-product so long as the duties on those remain.

The President, after reiterating his belief that the adoption of this measure will not reduce the price of wheat and other farm products "in any marked way," continues:

It will, however, by enlarging the source of supply, prevent undue fluctuations, and it will and ought to prevent an exorbitant increase in the prices of farm products—

I hope every farmer will pay marked attention to this. I still quote from the President's speech—

which, as they have been for the last three or four years, have inured greatly to the profit of all engaged in agriculture.

Who is there here who will take and defend the utterances made by a Republican President against the interests of all the American producers of this great country?

Mr. CLAPP. I do not see the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] present.

Mr. GRONNA. I like the Senator from Missouri. I wish he were here. He honored me with his presence for a little while. I only hoped he would remain, and I believe that even the distinguished Senator from Missouri would have learned something about wheat and a few other things.

Reduced to its lowest terms, this expression of the President means that while the measure will not reduce the price of wheat and other farm products below the present level, it will, and the President hopes it will, prevent the price from increasing in the future.

The only undue fluctuations that it will prevent will be the increase in price due to short crops. In other words, when our farmers suffer from drought, as did the western farmers last year, and it becomes a serious question with them how to tide over until the next crop is harvested, the President would have the Canadian wheat as a supply to fall back upon in order to

prevent the farmer from getting a slightly higher price for his wheat because of the shortage.

That is the statement made by my friend the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], if I remember correctly.

The President enters a flat denial of the statement that because of our higher tariffs the price of living is higher here than in Canada, and in support of this denial points to two facts: (1) We export to Canada \$225,000,000 worth of goods of the widest variety of manufactures, while England, having a preference of 33½ per cent in the matter of tariffs, exports goods to Canada worth only \$93,000,000. (2) In negotiating this agreement the President directed the American commissioners "to secure as great a cut in the duties on manufactures in Canada as they could," but they were unable to secure any more than appears in this treaty, for the reason that Canada would not expose her manufacturers to the competition of American manufacturers, which is a very conclusive proof that the manufactured products that enter into the cost of living are higher in Canada than they are in the United States. With regard to the first fact, it might be suggested that most people would regard it as proof that our manufacturers can compete with the English manufacturers on even terms, at least in the Canadian markets, and presumably in our markets, and that they consequently do not need protection. The same persons would not necessarily find the second proof conclusive, for the reason that it has often been charged that the American manufacturers are in the habit of selling their goods cheaper in Canada than in the United States, and that while the Canadian manufacturers may believe that the American manufacturers can sell their goods cheaper than they themselves can sell the same goods, it is no proof that the American manufacturers do sell those goods cheaper in the American markets.

I want my distinguished friend again to pay attention to this, because I know he will be interested in what I am about to say. I remember he asked some questions a couple of weeks ago why the opening up of the new Northwestern States had not caused a decline in the lands in neighboring States. I am not quoting the Senator verbatim, but, I believe, in substance, and I am going to show him—at least I shall attempt to show—how it works.

The President, to disprove the contention that the free admission to our markets of the products of the cheaper Canadian lands will operate to lower the prices of farm lands in this country, cites the fact that the value of the lands in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Wisconsin, and other States has increased in spite of the opening up of the lands in Kansas, Nebraska, and North and South Dakota in the two decades from 1890 to 1910. The conditions are not quite the same, however. On the opening up of the new wheat lands in the newer States, Iowa, Illinois, and the other States mentioned did surrender the growing of wheat very largely to the new States, turning their attention to raising corn and hogs. If there had not been these other things to turn to, the value of their lands would beyond a doubt have been seriously affected. Kansas and Nebraska can hardly be said to have been opened up since 1890. The population of Nebraska has increased only 130,000 since 1890, and the population of Kansas about 270,000. Between 1890 and 1900 the population of Kansas increased only 42,000, and the population of Nebraska only 3,644. This in spite of the fact that both of these States are great corn States, Kansas producing 169,000,000 bushels in 1910, and Nebraska 206,000,000 bushels. The only States that exceeded Nebraska's production last year were Illinois, Iowa, and Missouri. In the case of the competition of Canadian lands, however, it must be borne in mind that not all the States on this side of the line can turn to other crops. North Dakota will continue to raise wheat, flax, oats, and barley, if it raises anything, and it will have to do this in competition with the cheaper and more productive Canadian lands. This can have only one effect on land values in that State. Some of the other States at present growing wheat and other small grains may turn to corn, but there will be a decided loss because of the forced change of crop and the increased competition in the raising of corn. Even States that may not feel the Canadian competition directly will be affected indirectly.

That is just how Kansas and Nebraska are going to be affected and every corn-producing State. Further, the area with which we are now to be brought into competition is greatly in excess of that brought into competition with our older lands by the opening up of our last west. As has been shown, the three prairie Provinces of Canada contain as much land as eight or nine of the States comprising our Middle West, and practically all of it is fitted for the production of wheat and other grains. With the efforts of the Canadian Government, the Canadian rail-

roads, and the land companies to promote immigration to that region, the opening up of the Canadian lands will proceed at a much more rapid rate than did the opening up and settlement of our lands. The settling of North Dakota has been in progress for 30 years.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. As I recall it, the question which I addressed here upon the floor to a Senator who had been speaking was something like this: He had quoted from some statistical tables to show that the average value of farm lands in North Dakota was some \$40 or \$45 per acre, whereas in Canada the land was worth \$20 or \$25 per acre, and he drew the conclusion that if that \$25 land in Canada was thrown into competition with the \$40 land in North Dakota the results would be disastrous to the North Dakota farmer. The question I put to him was whether he argued from that that the competition of the North Dakota farmer with the \$40 land had been disastrous to the farmers in Nebraska with their \$100 land; and I drew his attention to the fact that there is as much disparity in the value of farm lands in the agricultural States of the United States as there is between the value of farm lands in North Dakota and Canada, and that these lands nevertheless competed with each other without any serious consequences.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator from Nebraska contend that these lands compete with each other without any serious consequences?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. My impression is that the prosperity of Nebraska was not seriously affected by the development of North Dakota, and we in Nebraska have rejoiced to see the neighboring States and Territories develop. We would rather see a State like North or South Dakota prosperous in its agriculture than to see it a desert waste; and so it seems to me the people of the United States would rather see a great prosperous agricultural empire in Canada than to see a rolling desert of Sahara there. I believe it is a better neighbor.

Mr. BORAH. It might make some difference whether they are under our flag or under another man's flag. But does not the Senator from Nebraska think that the opening of Nebraska and Illinois and Wisconsin and all that great region had a very powerful effect upon the productiveness, or the capacity to produce, of the eastern farmer?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think the fact is that the eastern farmer had exhausted his land and that his crop average had been reduced year by year until it was approaching the point where it would be impossible to continue the cultivation.

Mr. BAILEY. Except at high prices.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think, furthermore, that the development of a neighboring State in the way it is pictured that Canada will develop will immeasurably improve the conditions in the United States for their mutual and reciprocal trade relations. I believe that this country will get great benefit, even if Canada does develop in the marvelous way of which the Senators tell and which I think is grossly exaggerated.

Mr. BORAH. If the Senator will pardon me for just a moment, when the lands of the Middle West were opened up the farms in the East began to be abandoned. Within the last seven or eight years those farms are again being taken up and rehabilitated, owing to the increase in the price of farm products. Now, the question is whether it is better for us to raise our own products, when we can, than to skin our farms, as we will do in Nebraska and the Dakotas and other places, as we did in the East, and move on to Canada.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think the Senator from Idaho has committed an inaccuracy there. The prices of farm products are now no higher than they have been for 10 years in the past.

The fact is that there is an attempt being made to revive the abandoned farms of the East, but it is an attempt that is being made along scientific lines to make productive what has been allowed to become a desert, and allowed to become so by exhaustion of the soil. The attempt is now being made not so much by individual farmers as by great railroads to restore those lands to productivity by putting enrichment upon them.

Mr. BORAH. And they are doing so because the price of farm products warrants them in doing so.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But the price of farm products is not now so high as it was two years ago.

Mr. BORAH. That is true.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And 10 years ago they were as high as recently.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator is about correct in his dates. It was just about 10 years ago that the price of farm products began to rise, and ever since that time there has been a noticeable retardation of the movement from the farm to the city, and the taking up of the abandoned farms and occupying them and rehabilitating them and recultivating them have been going on, and it has been by reason of the fact that the increase in the price of farm products has warranted them in doing so.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Of course, I may say to my friend, the Senator from Idaho, that there is also another reason why the farms of the East were abandoned besides that they had become exhausted. One reason is that the party to which the Senator belongs for the last generation or more has been placing an enormous premium upon industrial occupations, has been offering a great allurements to people to move into the cities and to abandon their farms, and has been placing upon agriculture a great burden which, up to this time, it has endured for the benefit of those cities and towns which have been growing while the country has been under a process of depopulation.

Mr. BORAH. The charge that the Senator makes is, in a measure, true. But until we secured the active agency and cooperation of the party to which the Senator belongs we have never been able to put the farmer upon a free-trade basis and the manufacturer upon a highly protective basis, which the Senator and his party are helping us to do now.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I call the attention of the Senator from Idaho to the fact that the most distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. ROOR], a prominent leader of the party to which the Senator belongs, and of which he is also a leader, upon the floor of the Senate within 10 days made the statement the tariffs which have been placed upon the products of the farm in the past have, in his opinion, been of no benefit to the farmer.

Mr. BORAH. Until lately.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; he made the statement that they had been in the past of no benefit to the farmer, although they had been there for a generation, and although the Democratic Party and the Democratic leaders had been arguing that those tariffs placed upon agricultural products were put there for the purpose of hoodwinking the farmer into the belief that he had a share in the plunder of this protective tariff.

Mr. BORAH. I appeal to the Record, that the Senator from New York used the exact language that until late the protective tariff had not been of benefit to the farmer—that until late years he had not received any benefit therefrom.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator is mistaken. I quoted the exact language of the Senator from New York.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. That has been reiterated a half a dozen times by the Senator from New York.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator from New York distinctly stated that if they would read all the language it would qualify what they had quoted.

Mr. GRONNA. In justice to the Senator from New York, who does not happen to be present just now, I will see that that part of his remarks is inserted in my speech.

Mr. BAILEY. Right at this point—

Mr. STONE. May I be permitted to interpose?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. STONE. While the Senator is inserting the remarks of the Senator from New York—

Mr. GRONNA. I intended to quote the Senator from New York, but I have so many things that I want to touch upon that I eliminated what would have made many pages.

Mr. STONE. Well, it is a pity the Senator did that, if what he destroyed was as good as that he has delivered.

Mr. GRONNA. I am glad to know the Senator from Missouri appreciates it.

Mr. STONE. Yes. I want to suggest to my friend the Senator from North Dakota that while he is inserting what the Senator from New York said, that which the Senator from Nebraska has quoted—

Mr. WARREN. In part.

Mr. STONE. I suppose in part. He certainly did not quote the entire speech.

Mr. GRONNA. I said upon that particular point, Mr. President.

Mr. STONE. I was going to suggest that it might be well in a parallel column to insert a wise remark made by one of

the wisest of our colleagues, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], during the debate on the Payne-Aldrich bill. At that time, when answering a question propounded to him by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], the Senator from Minnesota said that while he could not at the moment tell how many bushels of wheat had been raised in a given year in Minnesota, he was prepared to state with the utmost confidence that the tariff had never benefited the farmers of Minnesota and had never added a farthing to the market price of their wheat; that the market value of wheat was fixed in Liverpool, and so on and so forth.

I am just suggesting that it would be most enlightening to the public in general and to the constituency of my friend, the Senator from North Dakota, in particular, if he would include that among his quotations.

Mr. NELSON and Mr. BORAH addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield, and to whom?

Mr. GRONNA. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. I want to say to the Senator from Missouri that I am very sorry to learn of the mental condition he is in with respect to this question of wheat. I am unwilling to take up the time of the Senator from North Dakota to answer him at this time. But later on in the discussion I shall take pains to give the Senator from Missouri some of the A B C's in respect to the prices of wheat, and hope to have him converted.

Mr. STONE. I do not know just what my friend means by my mental condition—

Mr. NELSON. I refer to the question of wheat—

Mr. STONE. On the subject of wheat. I do not know just what the Senator means. I know what I referred to, for I have been quoting as nearly literally as I can from memory a very wise expression, and a very correct one, delivered two years ago on the floor of the Senate by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Minnesota, and I have suggested that the Senator from North Dakota, while quoting from the Senator from New York, should embrace the other for the enlightenment of his constituents.

Mr. NELSON. In the first place, I want to say to the Senator from Missouri he does not quote me entirely and fully and correctly; and, in the next place, I shall endeavor to point out to him that the conditions which were existing then are entirely different from the conditions which are existing now.

Mr. STONE. Two years ago—

Mr. NELSON. But I am unwilling to take up the time of the Senator from North Dakota. He has quite a bit of a speech yet to make and has been on his feet for nearly two hours; but later on I will try to satisfy the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. STONE. If it be possible that my friend has changed his opinion and his position, I am sorry to hear it. If he has changed, then the Senator from North Dakota need not quote from him. I was supposing that the Senator from Minnesota was standing by his utterance of two years ago.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Minnesota is perfectly able to take care of himself, and the Senate will undoubtedly do him the honor to give him sufficient time to explain his position. I can only promise that I shall be very glad to be here to listen to the debate between the two distinguished Senators.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Before the Senator from North Dakota resumes—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; for a question.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to justify what I said—

Mr. GRONNA. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. As to my accuracy in quoting the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOR]. He used this language—

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the Senator from New York said a great deal, and I certainly would do an injustice to the Senator from New York to incorporate his entire speech into my remarks. Unless the Senator from Nebraska will read that particular portion of the speech of the Senator from New York, I hardly think it would be fair to read merely a part of his remarks on the subject.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator from North Dakota will remember that the Senator from Idaho questioned the accuracy of my quotation, and in order to justify my quotation I should like to read a few sentences.

Mr. GRONNA. I said to the Senator from Nebraska that I would agree to incorporate in my remarks the statement made by the Senator from New York touching upon wheat.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota will advise the Chair whether he yields or does not yield.

Mr. GRONNA. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska just to incorporate that particular quotation.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I quote from the speech of the Senator from New York [Mr. Root], on page 2427:

I never have thought that the duties which were imposed upon farm products were of any real general benefit to the farmer.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator from New York said more than that.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; he said more than that. I will read the whole paragraph if the Senator desires. I have read only that much to show that I was right in my statement that he used that language.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the quotation—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. GRONNA. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Nebraska is not reading the entire statement.

Mr. BAILEY. He is reading another part.

Mr. BORAH. That is what I supposed. I have just found what the Senator has read, but the Senator will remember that we discussed a day or two afterwards that remark of the Senator from New York and referred to the proposition that he said "until lately," and it is so printed in the Record.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. In this whole paragraph the Senator from New York did not qualify his expression in that way. I will repeat what he said. It is a sentence, complete:

I never have thought that the duties which were imposed upon farm products were of any real general benefit to the farmer.

Mr. GRONNA. But, Mr. President, the Senator from New York did qualify that statement.

Mr. BAILEY. Would the Senator—

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield, and to whom?

Mr. GRONNA. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. I want to say, Mr. President, that the Senator from Nebraska and the other Senators of like mind ought to take into account that the Senator from New York is not a farmer.

Mr. GRONNA. I now yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska is right as to one passage in the speech; the Senator from Idaho is right as to another passage in the speech. If the Senator from Nebraska will turn back to the first column on page 2427 he will find that after making substantially the same statement there which the Senator from Nebraska has read from the second column the Senator from New York then uses substantially and practically the language attributed to him by the Senator from Idaho, and it is this:

But with the increase of our cities as compared with our farming population and the using up of our waste lands and the fencing in of old cattle ranges and the reduction of the productive power of our land we have about come to the point where the continuance of those duties, instead of being a matter of indifference to the people of the country, would result in putting up the cost of food.

It is a little difficult for a man to make a speech on that side of the question without falling into these contradictions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota will proceed.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, a decade is likely to see the prairies of Canada settled. The effect of the free admission of Canadian products will be comparable to the effect of the opening of the West on the agriculture of New England and other Eastern States. It seems hardly necessary to call attention to the abandoned farms and depressed land prices and the emigration from that section of the agricultural population which resulted.

The President also contends that the natural change in farming in this country is from the raising of wheat and other cereals for export to the raising of grain for farm consumption and development of the secondary products in the form of cattle and hogs. He fails to take into consideration that there are some sections of our country that can produce wheat and other grains that can not produce corn at an advantage. North Dakota is not a corn-growing and hog-raising State, but it does raise wheat and flax and other grains, and it certainly is not statesmanship to try to force the people of that section to discontinue the raising of crops for which the State is best fitted for the growing of crops for which it is less fitted and which it may never be possible to produce extensively with profit. It has appeared to me that in encouraging industries the Government should encourage those in each section for which that section has the best advantages. Now, however, it is proposed that

we discourage the raising of grains in the States that can produce them to greater advantage than any other crops merely because a foreign country would like to have our markets for grains for her own products.

There is no danger of our not producing enough wheat for our own consumption if the farmer is assured of a fair price. If, however, the farmers are to be subjected to the competition of the Canadian wheat, which can be raised more cheaply, I have no doubt that we shall be importing wheat in a few years. The Secretary of Agriculture in his report for the year 1909 discusses the probable future production of wheat in this country. He believes that with a more intensive agriculture the yield per acre of wheat will be increased—

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. GRONNA. Let me finish this sentence and then I will yield.

And also states that in the older States there has lately been an increase in the acreage devoted to wheat. This has operated to increase our production in addition to the increase due to new lands being brought under cultivation. He estimates that by 1950 our production may be between 3,750,000,000 and 4,750,000,000 bushels, while our consumption would not exceed 1,400,000,000 bushels, even with a population of 200,000,000.

Now I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. In order to save the Senator the trouble of looking up the quotation, I have the exact language here from the speech of the Senator from New York, as published in the Record.

Mr. WARREN. On what page?

Mr. BORAH. On page 2427. The Senator from New York said:

I do not think that as a class in general up to this time or until, perhaps, within a very short period, the protection upon food products has been of any real advantage to the farmer.

Mr. GRONNA. I thank the Senator from Idaho for his quotation. While I am inclined to believe that neither our population nor our production will be as large as indicated by the Secretary, I do believe that we shall be fully able to raise all the wheat that we require for our own consumption until 1950, and later if we do not adopt a policy of deliberately discouraging the production of wheat in this country—whether through the free admission of Canadian wheat or otherwise, I am satisfied that the free admission of wheat from Canada will mean the surrender of wheat growing to that country to a large extent for some years to come.

In the competition of the production of crops the land that produces more cheaply will prevail. In the case of the Canadian lands, the difference in the cost of transporting the wheat to our markets—if any there be—will not be sufficient to overcome the advantages which the Canadian farmer has. Some time in the future, when the Canadian lands have been cropped to the extent that ours have and require as much labor and cultivation to produce a bushel of wheat as ours now do, we may be able to compete on even terms in the production of wheat, but until that stage is reached the free admission of her grain will mean that we must to a large extent go out of the business of raising wheat, the extent depending on the rapidity with which her wheat land is brought under cultivation. This does not necessarily mean that our production of wheat will suddenly stop. Those lands that can produce wheat and other grains, but which can not produce corn to advantage, will continue to produce wheat even while there is no profit in doing so, and in most cases after it has become evident that every year's operations are carried on at a loss. As was well pointed out by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY], the farm differs from a factory in that it is a home. In the case of a factory, its operation will stop when the owner is convinced that the loss from its operation is greater than the loss that would result from its remaining idle, but in the case of a farm the owner will cling to it long after it has stopped returning any profit, will curtail his expenses, both of operation and living, wherever possible, and will not leave it until he is in absolute danger of starvation. For this reason, it is to be presumed that in the event of the passage of this measure we shall continue to produce considerable wheat in competition with the Canadian wheat, even if it be produced at a loss.

Mr. President, I do not know whether the Senator from Texas has any objection to my referring to him or not, but I want to say for myself that I appreciate that there is one Democrat, one man from the Southern States, who recognizes and values the honest toil of the farmer.

One of those appearing before the Finance Committee in favor of the Canadian reciprocity agreement, urged that it would be a benefit to North Dakota to abandon wheat growing, and gave the impression that he was in favor of forcing the North Dakota farmer to stop growing wheat and devote himself to diversified farming. There are certain kinds of diversified farming, however, to which North Dakota can not adapt itself, and the same is true of other States. But even when a State is fitted for diversified farming, it is not farsighted statesmanship to attempt to force the farmers into it. When farmers in a certain region continue to grow a certain crop, it is because it is more profitable to grow that crop. If that region is also adapted for the production of other crops, the farmers will begin to grow them when it becomes profitable to do so, which, as a rule, is when they find that they can compete successfully with other sections producing them. So far as North Dakota is concerned, I am satisfied that because of her climate and soil wheat will remain the great staple crop of the State, even though the Canadian competition makes it difficult for the farmer to grow it at a profit. With newer and consequently more productive lands, with cheaper lands, and with lower taxes, tariff and others, in Canada, the competition is an uneven one. In years to come when the conditions have become similar to those in this country, the competition may be on even terms, but until that time does come we have no right to ask the American wheat grower to compete in an open market with the Canadian wheat grower buying all his purchases in a protected market. I do not agree that we should surrender wheat growing to Canada because she can produce more cheaply. The fact that wheat can not be produced as cheaply in our wheat-growing States as in Canada does not prove that wheat is not the most profitable crop that can be produced in those States. It is not the part of wisdom to attempt to compel a State better fitted for the production of wheat than of other crops to abandon its present crop and produce those that it can produce only under a disadvantage compared with other States. If France and Germany and other countries have seen it worth while to encourage their farmers to produce enough wheat for home consumption, surely the United States should not blindly adopt a policy which some of its advocates clearly, and others by implication, state means the surrender of wheat growing to a foreign country. A nation producing its own food has within it the means of maintaining her political as well as her industrial independence. A nation dependent on other countries for her food is in danger of losing both.

The farmer of this country has not been unduly prosperous. The great fortunes which have been made—whether they are being squandered in extravagance or whether they are being used wisely in the industries—have not been made on the farm. The Select Committee on Wages and Prices of Commodities says in its report—I am sorry the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge], is absent. I quote from the report of the committee:

Witnesses agree that farming operations were conducted at a loss, or at best with only a very slight margin of profit for several years—

Mark this—

and that only during the past two or three years have farmers been able to secure a fair return on their labor and investment.

I do not know what they propose to do now.

The wealth of the farmers has increased, but largely through increase in the value of their land. This, however, is somewhat in the nature of profit on speculation, and not a profit from crops or live stock produced.

The State University of Minnesota—

I still quote from the report of this committee—

The State University of Minnesota has since 1902 kept in the greatest detail records of a number of farms in that State. Allowing the farmer, his wife, and children pay at current rates for all labor performed, the net profits during the three years 1905 to 1907 was only 4.09 per cent, and this profit advanced to about 6 per cent for the two years 1908 and 1909. The profit during the past two years approximates the average interest on farm mortgages in that State.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I believe that is a true report of the condition of the farmer.

A statement submitted to the committee by Mr. Thomas P. Cooper, of the Minnesota State University, shows that the average cost of production on the farms under observation during the two years 1908 and 1909 was as follows: Wheat, 75 cents per bushel; oats, 38.3 cents per bushel; corn, 41.2 cents per bushel; barley, 40.9 cents per bushel; flax, 103.7 cents per bushel; potatoes, 30 cents per bushel.

The figures submitted by Mr. Cooper refer merely to the cost of production in Minnesota. The farm values of the crops

in that State for the years 1908 and 1909 are given as follows by the Department of Agriculture:

| Crops. | Farm value in cents per bushel. | |
|---------------|---------------------------------|---------------|
| | Dec. 1, 1908. | Dec. 1, 1909. |
| Wheat..... | 94 | 96 |
| Oats..... | 43 | 35 |
| Corn..... | 55 | 49 |
| Barley..... | 49 | 47 |
| Flax..... | 120 | 150 |
| Potatoes..... | 56 | 35 |

Former President Roosevelt in 1908—and I ask Senators to mark some of the words of that illustrious statesman—appointed a Commission on Country Life. It consisted of Prof. L. H. Bailey, of the New York State College of Agriculture, chairman; Mr. Henry Wallace, of Wallace's Farmer; President K. L. Butterfield, of the Massachusetts Agricultural College; Mr. Gifford Pinchot, at that time chief of the Forest Service; Mr. Walter H. Page, editor of the World's Work. Later Mr. C. S. Barrett, of Georgia, and W. A. Beard, of California, were added. This commission was appointed to inquire into the conditions of country life and to consider its problems—those which the Government can help solve as well as those which must depend for their solution on the intelligence and energy of the farmer himself. In transmitting the report of this commission to Congress, Col. Roosevelt made the following statement, to which I wish to call attention:

I warn my countrymen that the great recent progress made in city life is not a full measure of our civilization; for our civilization rests at bottom on the wholesomeness, the attractiveness, and the completeness, as well as the prosperity, of life in the country.

From the treatment that the measure now before us has received, it is evident that many of us are in danger of forgetting the truth which Col. Roosevelt so well expressed. If there was the slightest consideration of what the farmer's welfare demanded, in the framing of the agreement with Canada, there certainly is no evidence of it. The commission in its report says:

Yet it is true, notwithstanding all this progress as measured by historical standards, that agriculture is not commercially as profitable as it is entitled to be for the labor and energy that the farmer expends and the risks that he assumes, and that the social conditions in the open country are far short of their possibilities. We must measure our agricultural efficiency by its possibilities rather than by comparison with previous conditions. The farmer is almost necessarily handicapped in the development of his business, because his capital is small and the volume of his transactions limited, and he usually stands practically alone against organized interests.

Mr. President, those are significant words.

Thoughtful men have long seen the danger lying in the overemphasis of manufacturing and commerce, resulting in our becoming more and more a nation of city dwellers. Our laws have unduly enhanced the importance of these industries, and agriculture has been robbed of its dignity along with part of its just remuneration. The result is, in the case of many of the older States, not merely a relative but an absolute decrease in the number of farmers, while the cities have increased immensely in population. I have not been able to get figures from the last census for all the States with reference to this, but I have from some of the States. In Massachusetts there were 1,203 fewer farmers in 1910 than in 1900, and by farmer I mean the person who operates the farm. This is a decrease of 3 per cent. In Missouri there were 8,805 fewer in 1910 than 10 years previous; in New Hampshire, 2,411; in New Jersey, 1,489; in New York, 12,070; in Ohio, 5,336; in Pennsylvania, 5,854; in Vermont, 506; in Connecticut, 517; and in Illinois, 13,298 fewer farmers than in 1900. In other words, there were that many fewer farms in each State. Even in Minnesota there was almost a standstill, the increase in 10 years being only 1,100. It might be thought that the decrease in the number of farms might be due to a tendency toward larger farms, but the reports show that the acreage in farms has also decreased in all of the above-named States. The figures which I have obtained so far show the following decreases in the acreage of farms in different States: Illinois, 324,000 acres; Connecticut, 136,000 acres; California, 946,000 acres; West Virginia, 694,000 acres; Vermont, 71,000 acres; Utah, 763,000 acres; Pennsylvania, 825,000 acres; Ohio, 428,000 acres; New York, 650,000 acres; New Jersey, 279,000 acres; New Hampshire, 368,000 acres; Missouri, 518,000 acres; Massachusetts, 277,000 acres. These 13 States show decreases in farm acreages of more than 6,000,000 acres. These figures are preliminary and may not quite correspond with the final

figures, but it is not thought that the changes will be material. To how large an amount the States for which I have no figures will bring the total I have no way of estimating. These figures are enough to show that the number of farmers in the older States is decreasing and that farms are being abandoned.

The population figures for the country, by counties, also indicate the same fact. In Ohio, for instance, there was a decrease in 39 out of 88 counties; in Illinois, in 50 out of 102; in Indiana, in 56 out of 92; in Michigan, in 26 out of 83; in Wisconsin, in 19 out of 70; in Iowa, in 71 out of 99; in Missouri, in 71 out of 115; in Nebraska, in 21 out of 90; in Kansas, in 33 out of 105; and even in Minnesota there was a decrease in 27 counties out of 82. In the counties where there are increases instead of decreases, this was often due to the fact that cities of some size were situated in them.

In view of these facts, would it not be the part of wisdom to carefully scrutinize all legislation that may affect the farmer and to refuse our sanction to measures, whether drafted by the President or not, which may affect him injuriously? The Country Life Commission, in making its report, said:

Notwithstanding an almost universal recognition of the importance of agriculture to the maintenance of our people there is nevertheless a widespread disregard of the rights of the men who own and work the land. This results directly in social depression, as well as in economic disadvantage.

The organized and corporate interests represented in mining, manufacturing, merchandising, transportation, and the like, seem often to hold the idea that their business may be developed and exploited without regard to the farmers, who should, however, have an equal opportunity for enjoyment of the land, forests, and streams, and of the right to buy and sell in the open markets without prejudice.

The commission further says:

We find that there is need of a new general attitude toward legislation, in the way of safeguarding the farmer's natural rights and interests. It is natural that the organized and consolidated interests should be strongly in mind in the making of legislation. We recommend that the welfare of the farmer and countryman be also kept in mind in the construction of laws. We specially recommend that his interests be considered and safeguarded in any new legislation on the tariff, on regulation of railroads, control or regulating of corporations, and of speculation, river, swamp, and forest legislation, and public-health regulations. At the present moment it is especially important that the farmer's interests be well considered in the revision of the tariff. One of the particular needs is such an application of the reciprocity principle as to open European markets for our flour, meats, and live cattle. One of the great economic problems of our agriculture is how to feed the corn crop and other grains profitably, for it must be fed if the fertility of the land is to be maintained; to dispose of the crop profitably requires the best markets that can be secured.

This commission said in 1908 that it was "especially important that the farmer's interests be well considered in the revision of the tariff." That "one of the particular needs is such an application of the reciprocity principle as to open European markets for our flour, meats, and live cattle." That "to dispose of the crop profitably requires the best markets that can be secured." One can not but be struck by the difference between the views of this commission, consisting of able and thoughtful men, who had investigated the conditions surrounding farm life, and had an idea of its needs on these questions as compared with those of the present administration and other supporters of this measure. This administration does not seem to think that the interests of the farmer should be well considered in the revision of the tariff. This administration does not appear to believe that there is any need of applying the reciprocity principle so as to extend the market of our farm products in Europe. This administration does not appear to believe that there is any need or desirability of conserving the markets of the farmer at home, to say nothing about extending his markets abroad. The reciprocity agreement which this administration is trying to force through Congress extends the market of the Canadian farmer at the expense of the American farmer, and increases the profits of the Beef Trust, the millers, and the railroads.

It has been urged that the American farmer ought to be willing to accept this measure for a year's trial, at the end of which it is intimated that it may be repealed if it does not work satisfactorily—and some of the administration's supporters have pointed to the willingness of the President to agree to this and the unwillingness of the farmers to do so as a proof of the reasonableness of the one and the unreasonableness of the other. It would seem unnecessary to call anyone's attention to the fact that the President and the farmers are in far different positions so far as this proposition is concerned, but it seems that it is necessary in this debate to call attention to a good many things that everyone knew and understood until this reciprocity agreement was sent hurtling into Congress. If this measure becomes a law and works badly—if its effects are injurious, as the farmers have reason to believe they will be—how will that affect the President? At most it will mean only a loss of prestige. But how will it affect the farmer? In the three wheat States, Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Da-

kota, the loss on wheat alone, if the price is decreased 10 cents a bushel, will in average years be from \$20,000,000 to \$25,000,000.

On flax the loss to the North Dakota farmers, if the price is lowered to the amount of the present tariff, will be over \$4,000,000. Witnesses before the Finance Committee testified to the belief that such an experiment would cost the farmers of these three States at least \$40,000,000 a year, and the farmers of the entire country \$300,000,000 a year. Has the farmer of this country been hoarding wealth to such an extent that he should be subjected to the possibility of losing hundreds of millions of dollars in order that an administration may see how some pet scheme will work? Is not the statement that this measure can be repealed at the end of a year and that the farmer ought to be content to accept it on these terms the bitterest mockery? The farmers all over the country are opposed to this measure. If they can not prevent it from becoming a law at this time what reason is there to believe that they will be able to secure its repeal at the end of a year? Will any Senator here tell me? Has the President shown himself so willing to listen to the representations of the farmers in regard to this measure that there is much prospect that he will accept a year's trial as sufficient to establish its merits? The farmers know that it is the merest pretense when it is said that this measure can be repealed at any time if it does not work satisfactorily. Those unable or unwilling to appreciate the farmers' condition at this time will be equally unable next year.

The benefits which it has been stated will accrue to the farmer from this agreement will, on examination, be found to be wholly imaginary. If there is any class or industry which will derive any benefit from it, it certainly is not the agricultural industry. There is absolutely no new market opened for the farmer's products. Canada is an agricultural country, and we are not going to sell her wheat, or oats, or barley, or cattle, or flax, or hay. We are not because of this agreement going to sell her any more cotton or corn than we did, for the simple reason that these products are already on her free list. So far as farm products are concerned, the only increase in our trade with Canada will consist in her exporting a larger amount to us than she has done previously; we shall not only permit her but invite her to invade our markets. The injustice to the farmer involved in this is recognized by the Committee on Ways and Means, when it says in its majority report on the free-list bill.

I want my friends on the other side to pay particular attention to this, because this quotation is your own child.

In fact, action on the Canadian agreement involves the necessity of further and immediate action in removing a number of duties on imports from other countries, in order that justice may be done to the great army of our agricultural producers, who in the Canadian agreement are to have all the alleged protection removed from their products without a corresponding or reciprocal removal of the protective duties most burdensome on the commodities they must purchase as necessary to sustain their lives and industries. As a beginning in the correction of this injustice, against which our farmers properly protest, the bill (H. R. 4413) herewith reported, has been framed.

That is what the Democrats in the other body said, "to remedy this injustice" done by the Democratic majority, "against which our farmers properly protest."

They acknowledge that the farmer does protest. They seem to have no doubt but that the farmers will suffer from this iniquitous agreement. I would like to know from some Senator on the other side of this Chamber whether they believe that the report made by the majority in the other body is true or not.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. GRONNA. With pleasure.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator mean to say that the committee of the House reported that this bill was an unmixed injustice? Is it not true that in the rest of the report they set forth the reasons why this bill should be passed? Is it not true that the spirit of their report is that it would be unjust to pass this reciprocity bill and not go further and take duties off other articles? Is not that the fairer statement of the matter?

Mr. GRONNA. I believe that the Senator from Missouri is in a better position to know what the distinguished committee meant by making this statement—I have quoted it verbatim; and in replying to the Senator, as to the spirit, I will simply ask, Is it another case where the spirit is willing, but the flesh is undoubtedly weak?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the flesh, if that is the term used to describe the Democratic Party in the House of Representatives, was strong enough to apply the specific remedy referred to in the paragraph of the report the Senator has read. They did pass bills intended to meet the very condition referred to.

Now, I take it the Senator believes this bill is unjust to the farmer.

Mr. GRONNA. I not only believe it, but I know it is.

Mr. REED. Yes; and that it is especially unjust, in his opinion, because the burdens are not taken off of the farmer on the things he purchases.

Mr. GRONNA. Right here—is the Senator from Missouri willing to help me to take this free-list bill and attach it to the reciprocity bill to give the farmers the justice your own committee has said they are entitled to?

Mr. REED. The Senator interrupted my question with one before I was through.

Mr. GRONNA. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. REED. I want to ask him one—

Mr. GRONNA. I thought it was just the proper place to ask the Senator from Missouri a question.

Mr. REED. Certainly. I was about to ask—

Mr. GRONNA. If the Senator will pardon me, I am willing to vote to attach it to this reciprocity bill. Is the Senator from Missouri willing to help me to take away part of the burden that the American farmer has been subjected to, according to the statement of his party in the other body?

Mr. REED. I am sorry the Senator interrupted my question, because I was traveling to the same point.

Mr. GRONNA. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. REED. I will say to the Senator from North Dakota that the Democratic Members of the Senate, so far as I have heard expression of opinion, without exception, agree to the proposition that they are willing to remove from the farmer every possible burden, and that, so far as I know, they are willing to vote for those very measures which were passed by the House of Representatives to correct the inequalities which were referred to in the paragraph of the report the Senator read. I think there is absolute unanimity of opinion.

Now, I wanted to ask the Senator this question—

Mr. GRONNA. Will the Senator answer my question?

Mr. REED. I will answer the Senator.

Mr. GRONNA. Before the Senator asks me a question, will the Senator answer my question?

Mr. REED. But I will ask this one in its order, and then answer with perfect frankness.

Mr. GRONNA. Very well.

Mr. REED. If this bill does pass, will the Senator help the Democrats to relieve the farmer of these inequalities by helping to pass the bills the House of Representatives has already sent in?

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator from Missouri wants me to answer that question?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. GRONNA. What assurance can the Senator from Missouri give me that the free-list bill will become a law and relieve the farmer providing the reciprocity bill does pass the Senate?

Mr. REED. I am asking whether, if this does pass, you would go that far with us. Of course, I can not speak for the President. The Senator has already answered the question he has asked me. So far as I know the Democratic opinion is that they would be willing, I think that they would all be willing, to add the House free-list bill and reduction bills to this measure if two things could be assured: One that the bill as thus amended would pass the Senate; and, second, that it would be signed by the President and become a law.

Now, the Senator has already indicated a fear in his own mind that the President would not sign the House bills if they came to him separately.

Mr. GRONNA. I did not intend to indicate any such fear, as will be shown by the statement which I shall make later on. I think it is unfair to the President of the United States to criticize him or to entertain any fear that he will veto any measure until he is given an opportunity to do so. But that is not answering the question which I put to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. Oh, yes. The Senator just asked me this question, Whether I could give him the assurance that if these House bills were added to this bill it would become a law? and I took it that he meant that the President's veto might be interposed, because if it passed this House it would only lack that signature in order to become a law.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, if the Senator—

Mr. REED. It would also lack the concurrence of the House, but the action of the House is assured.

Mr. CLAPP. I wanted to remind the Senator that we have had some experience here in conference matters which would have to be embraced in the suggestion that it would become a law.

Mr. REED. Possibly. Now I will answer the Senator. If the Senator from North Dakota—

Mr. GRONNA. I will listen to the Senator—

Mr. REED. If the Senator can give assurance that if this bill is amended by adding the House free list and reduction bills it will be signed by the President of the United States, I am ready to vote for it, provided there are enough votes to assure it would pass here.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator has not answered my question.

Mr. REED. I thought I had.

Mr. GRONNA. The question I am most deeply interested in is the first question I put to the Senator from Missouri.

Will the Senator from Missouri help me to protect the farmers of this country by amending the bill so as to at least give them a very small benefit by attaching the free list to the reciprocity agreement? Will the Senator from Missouri vote with me for such an amendment?

Mr. REED. The very moment the Senator—

Mr. GRONNA. That is the question I should like to have answered.

Mr. REED. The very moment the Senator gives us the assurance that the President will not veto it in that form.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. REED. I have not the floor to yield, but I will be glad to yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair asked the Senator from North Dakota if he would yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. GRONNA. Has the Senator from Missouri concluded his question?

Mr. REED. I was through. I said I did not have the floor to yield, but I would be glad to yield.

Mr. GRONNA. If the Senator from Missouri has any further question to ask I will be glad to yield to him.

Mr. REED. Nothing further than to make this statement: I think it is a good time to make it, because we all ought to deal here openly and fairly on this great matter with ourselves and with the country. I think the Democratic position is that the reciprocity bill does not go as far as they would like to have it go. They want other, further, and additional relief for the people of the United States; not the farmers alone, but all classes of citizens. That is the position.

The fear of the Democrats is that if this bill is amended at all here in the Senate it may then be beaten in part by the votes of the very men who helped to amend it; and if it is not beaten, but is passed by the Senate, then it will be vetoed by the President. I think the Democratic position is that the reciprocity bill, while far from perfect, is better than no step in the direction of tariff reduction.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

Mr. GRONNA. I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. REED. Just let me conclude what I have been saying, and then I will yield.

Mr. GRONNA. Very well.

Mr. REED. I take it that the position of our friends represented by the Senator upon his feet is a little similar. He does not so much object to the reciprocity measure if he could carry the reform far enough to equalize the reduction on farm products, but he hesitates to have the reductions go up in separate bills for fear the President will veto them, and he believes that the measure, without the other additional bills or amendments, is a bad bill.

Mr. WARREN. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. REED. When I conclude. Now, the trouble with us is not so much where we are trying to go as the assurance that we will get to the destination. And I say again, and I put it to the Senator, can he bring the assurance to the Democrats of this Chamber that if this bill is passed by the Senate and passed by the House with the free-list amendment on, the President of the United States will permit it to become a law?

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. GRONNA. I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota, because I should like to answer all these questions at once.

Mr. NELSON. I am surprised at the questions and the disingenuousness of the Senator from Missouri. He knows that this measure passed chiefly by Democratic votes in the other House, and if it has the least show of passage in this House it is because it has the support of the Democratic Party. Most of the Republicans in this Chamber are opposed to that measure. Now, it seems to me, the question whether the bill will be signed by the President if we add the free-list bill ought to be

addressed to the President by those who are cooperating with him and who are sailing under his banner. Instead of addressing it to us, who are opposed to reciprocity, address it to the President, under whose flag and banner you are operating.

Mr. REED. Let me ask—

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. I ought to be permitted to answer one man at a time.

Mr. WARREN. This is along the same lines.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield, and to whom?

Mr. GRONNA. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. REED. I ought to be permitted to answer one at a time.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator has asked a question, and I am about to ask a question, and you can answer both. I want to ask why the Senator from Missouri has so studiously avoided informing us what the House will do. The newspapers have stated, and it has not been denied, that one of the reasons why they doubt that the President will sign it is because those who originated the measure and caused its passage in the House have refused absolutely to entertain it if we amend it here.

Mr. REED. Have I the permission—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. GRONNA. With pleasure.

Mr. REED. I want to say that I have neither studiously avoided nor otherwise avoided answering any question. When my good friend gets better acquainted with me he will know that I never do. I have no authority to speak for the House of Representatives; I hold no brief from that great body; but I am here to say that after talking with a number of men who have been very potential in the councils of the Democracy, without exception they have said to me that if the Senate amended this bill by adding the House free-list bills it would never go to conference; that it would be passed by the Democratic votes in the House of Representatives.

Now, I trust the Senator will not say I have avoided anything.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator's account from the House does not agree with the purported interviews with the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, which formulated these two bills. Perhaps the Senator is right; I do not doubt it; but there seems to be a difference between the testimony of the men in the House who have had most to do with it and the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. It is not the first time I have differed with newspapers; it is not the first time I have been right; and it may not be the first time I have been mistaken. I simply give my statement for what it is worth.

The statement was made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] that we were sailing under the President's banner. I do not think the Democratic Party ought to be accused of that. Simply because the President of the United States has gotten partially right on this great question and is taking one step in the right direction, and because we vote for it, we ought not to be required to stand sponsor for him or assume to be his spokesmen. There is no use trying to shift this responsibility, Mr. President. There are men on the other side of the Chamber in the councils of the President almost daily who represent the administration, practically and in a proper way. I say that without the slightest criticism. They are on the Republican side of this Hall; every one of them is here; and the question ought to be addressed by the Senator from Minnesota and by the Senator from North Dakota to the men who belong to the President's party and who are in the President's councils. If they can not get information from their own side of the Chamber, just come over to our side and help us a little and we will elect a President who will let us know whether a measure will be signed or not. I say that with respect, for if the President can properly go over this country, making speeches daily upon measures pending before Congress and advise the people, he may just as properly advise this body.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I had almost come to the conclusion that the Senator's party had kidnapped our President. I think it is unfair for him to ask me what I believe the President would do or would not do in a matter of this kind.

Mr. REED. With all due respect, when the Democracy start out kidnapping Presidents they will pick one for themselves.

Mr. GRONNA. As a ransom you demand that we surrender to the Canadian farmer the markets which belong to the American farmer, and that is more than the American farmer can stand.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. GRONNA. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NELSON. It is now late. The Senator has been on his feet for more than three hours. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. CULLOM. I hope the Senator from Minnesota will withdraw that motion, that we may have a brief executive session.

Mr. NELSON. Very well; I withdraw the motion.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After eight minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, July 7, 1911, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 6, 1911.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Frank L. Gilbert to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of Wisconsin, vice Frank R. Bentley, resigned.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Paul Charlton, of Nebraska, to be United States district judge for the district of Porto Rico, vice John J. Jenkins, deceased.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

Maj. Edwin R. Stuart, Corps of Engineers, to be professor of drawing at the United States Military Academy, to take effect October 4, 1911, vice Prof. Charles W. Larned, who died June 19, 1911.

CAVALRY ARM.

Squadron Sergt. Maj. Romney T. Jewell, Eleventh Cavalry, to be second lieutenant of Cavalry, with rank from June 30, 1911.

MEDICAL RESERVE CORPS.

To be first lieutenants with rank from June 30, 1911.

Thomas Henry Watkins, of Louisiana.
Clark David Brooks, of Michigan.
Warfield Theobald Longcope, of Pennsylvania.
Charles Aaron Hull, of Nebraska.
Albert Ernst Taussig, of Missouri.
Edwin Clyde Henry, of Nebraska.
Louis Barth, of Michigan.
Park Weed Willis, of Washington.
Horace Russel Allen, of Indiana.
Mark Marshall, of Michigan.
James Fleming Breakey, of Michigan.
Reuben Peterson, of Michigan.
Hermann Johannes Boldt, of New York.
Marcus Claude Terry, jr., of California.
Francis St. Clair Reilly, of Pennsylvania.
Arthur Ernest Lane, of Wyoming.
Lester Laurens Roos, of New York.
Will Garrison Merrill, of Wisconsin.
Frank Wilburn Dudley, at large.
Almon Pliny Goff, at large.
James Walker Smith, at large.
Howard White Seager, of California.
Elwin Witt Ames, at large.
Lewis Francis Bleazby, of California.
Michael Manley Waterhouse, of New York.

SECRETARY OF LEGATION AND CONSUL GENERAL.

Francis Munroe Endicott, of Massachusetts, now secretary of the legation at Santo Domingo, to be secretary of the legation and consul general of the United States of America at Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, to fill an original vacancy.

MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF PORTO RICO.

Manuel Camunas, of Porto Rico, vice Juan F. Vias Ochoteco, resigned.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Commander Albert L. Key to be a captain in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Commander Harry A. Field to be a captain in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. Commander Montgomery M. Taylor to be a commander in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. Commander Milton E. Reed to be a commander in the Navy from the 14th day of June, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. Ralph E. Pope to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. Willis G. Mitchell to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Lloyd W. Townsend to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Grafton A. Beall, jr., to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) William L. Calhoun to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Ensign Matthias E. Manly to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 13th day of February, 1911, upon the completion of three years' service as an ensign.

Paymasters Edward T. Hoopes and Cecil S. Baker, with the rank of lieutenant, to be paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, from the 1st day of July, 1911.

Naval Constructors William McEntee, William B. Ferguson, jr., and John A. Spilman, with the rank of lieutenant, to be naval constructors in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, from the 1st day of July, 1911.

Asst. Naval Constructor Lew M. Atkins, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to be an assistant naval constructor in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 1st day of July, 1911.

The following-named midshipmen to be ensigns in the Navy from the 5th day of June, 1911, to fill vacancies:

Eric L. Ellington and

Wallace L. Lind.

Passed Asst. Paymaster Chester G. Mayo to be a paymaster in the Navy from the 2d day of January, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 6, 1911.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Guy D. Goff to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Harry A. Weil to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Wisconsin.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Samuel B. Thomas to be a lieutenant commander.

Medical Inspector James C. Byrnes to be a medical director.

Asst. Surg. Joseph A. Biello to be a passed assistant surgeon.

Richard H. Laning, a citizen of Washington, to be an assistant surgeon.

The following-named ensigns to be assistant civil engineers:

David G. Copeland, and

Greer A. Duncan.

UNITED STATES MELTER AND REFINER.

Harrison J. Slaker to be melter and refiner of the United States assay office at New York, N. Y.

ENVOYS EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTERS PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Lewis Einstein to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Costa Rica.

William W. Russell to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to the Dominican Republic.

Evan E. Young to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Ecuador.

Charles Dunning White to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Honduras.

H. Percival Dodge to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Panama.

SECRETARIES OF LEGATIONS.

Jordan Herbert Stabler to be secretary of the legation at Guatemala.

Hugh S. Gibson to be secretary of the legation at Habana.

Edward T. Williams to be secretary of the legation at Peking.

Charles Campbell, jr., to be second secretary of the embassy at Tokyo.

George T. Summerlin to be second secretary of the legation at Peking.

William K. Wallace to be second secretary of the legation at Habana.

SECRETARY OF LEGATION AND CONSUL GENERAL.

Francis Munroe Endicott to be secretary of the legation and consul general at Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL CORPS.

First Lieut. Edgar D. Craft, Medical Reserve Corps, to be first lieutenant.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS.

Corps of Engineers.

Cadet Philip Bracken Fleming.

Cadet John Wesley Stewart.

Cadet Joseph Cowles Mehaffey.

Cadet Paul Sorg Reinecke.

Cadet Raymond Albert Wheeler.

Cavalry Arm.

Cadet John Everard Hatch.

Cadet Alexander Day Surles.

Cadet Philip James Kieffer.

Cadet Karl Slaughter Bradford.

Cadet Frederick Gilbreath.

Cadet Harrison Henry Cocke Richards.

Cadet Arthur Bayard Conard.

Cadet Frank Hall Hicks.

Cadet John Porter Lucas.

Cadet Wilfrid Mason Blunt.

Cadet James Craig Riddle Schwenck.

Cadet William Patrick Joseph O'Neill.

Cadet Frank Lazelle Van Horn.

Cadet Howell Marion Estes.

Cadet John Furman Wall.

Cadet Leo Gerald Heffernan.

Cadet Edwin Noel Hardy.

Field Artillery Arm.

Cadet Curtis Hoppin Nance.

Cadet Freeman Wate Bowley.

Cadet John C. Beatty.

Cadet Charles Anderson Walker, jr.

Cadet Bethel Wood Simpson.

Cadet Neil Graham Finch.

Coast Artillery Corps.

Cadet Charles Adam Schimelfenig.

Cadet Charles Reuben Baxter.

Cadet Gustav Henry Franke.

Cadet Hubert Gregory Stanton.

Cadet Harold Floyd Nichols.

Cadet Franklin Kemble.

Cadet Herbert Arthur Dargue.

Cadet John Griffith Booton.

Cadet James Blanchard Crawford.

Cadet Robert W. Clark, jr.

Cadet Robert Lincoln Gray.

Cadet John Louis Homer.

Cadet Robert Clyde Gildart.

Cadet George Derby Holland.

Cadet Joseph William McNeal.

Cadet Max Stanley Murray.

Infantry Arm.

Cadet Harry Russell Kutz.

Cadet Thompson Lawrence.

Cadet Harry James Keeley.

Cadet Charles Philip Hall.

Cadet William Edmund Larned.

Cadet Alfred John Betcher.

Cadet Charles Laurence Byrne.

Cadet George Richmond Hicks.

Cadet Haig Shekerjian.

Cadet Charles Sea Floyd.

Cadet Benjamin Curtis Lockwood, jr.

Cadet Carroll Armstrong Bagby.

Cadet Oliver Stelling McCleary.

Cadet Frederick Gilbert Dillman.

Cadet Gregory Hoisington.

Cadet Ziba Lloyd Drollinger.

Cadet Frank Butner Clay.

Cadet Jesse Amos Ladd.

Cadet Paul William Baade.

Cadet Joseph Laura Wier.

Cadet James Roy Newman Weaver.

Cadet James Daniel Burt.

Cadet Emanuel Villard Heidt.

Cadet William Henry Harrison Morris, jr.

Cadet Sidney Herbert Foster.

Cadet Carl Fish McKinney.

Cadet Roscoe Conkling Batson.

Cadet Allen Russell Kimball.

Cadet Ira Adelbert Rader.

Cadet Alvan Crosby Sandeford.

Cadet William Jay Calvert.

Cadet William Burrus McLaurin.
 Cadet Kenneth Ebbecke Kern.
 Cadet David Hamilton Cowles.
 Cadet Ira Thomas Wyche.
 Cadet Arthur Clyde Evans.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL CORPS.

Capt. Reuben B. Miller to be major.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

First Lieut. Nelson E. Margetts to be captain.
 First Lieut. Robert Davis to be captain.
 Second Lieut. Joseph W. Rumbough to be first lieutenant.
 Second Lieut. William McCleave to be first lieutenant.
 Second Lieut. Allan C. McBride to be first lieutenant.
 Second Lieut. Joe R. Brabson to be first lieutenant.

INFANTRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. Frank B. Jones to be colonel.
 Maj. James A. Goodin to be lieutenant colonel.
 Capt. Charles Miller to be major.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Cadet William Benjamin Hardigg to be second lieutenant.

CAVALRY ARM.

Cadet Thomas Jonathan Jackson Christian to be second lieutenant.

RETIRED LIST OF THE ARMY.

First Lieut. John S. Marshall, retired, with the rank of captain.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

James W. Roe, San Gabriel.

ILLINOIS.

Anthus Willard, Macon.

MINNESOTA.

Ralph Prescott, Le Roy.

NEW JERSEY.

James Steel, Little Falls.
 George N. Wimer, Palmyra.

OHIO.

Robert Cleland, Convoy.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

M. B. Cross, Ferguson.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn July 6, 1911.

Foster V. Brown, of Tennessee, to be United States district judge for the district of Porto Rico.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, July 7, 1911.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.
 Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.
 The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

COLUMBIA HOSPITAL FOR WOMEN.

The VICE PRESIDENT announced the appointment of Mr. GALLINGER to succeed himself as a director on the part of the Senate of the Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum in the District of Columbia, as provided for in the act of June 10, 1872.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution (J. Res. No. 149, A) memorializing Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to compel all interstate railroads to engage directly in the business of carrying and delivering express.

Whereas the present system of carrying on the express business of this country by companies which enter into private contract with railroads for the transportation of goods is an economic waste, in that such system requires and necessitates to a considerable extent duplicate equipment and investment and earnings necessary to insure a reasonable return on such duplicate investment; and

Whereas it is one of the paramount functions of both Nation and State to enact laws which will compel all business affected with a public interest to be so conducted as to afford to the people the best possible service at the lowest possible rate; and

Whereas to compel railroads to engage in the business of carrying and delivering express will obviate the necessity for duplicate investment and duplicate profit now existing; and

Whereas other countries, with success both economically and financially, have combined the railroad and express business: Therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That we respectfully request the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to compel all interstate railroads to engage directly in the business of carrying and delivering express; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Chief Clerks of the two Houses of Congress and to the United States Senators and Congressmen from Wisconsin.

C. A. INGRAM,
Speaker of the Assembly.
 H. C. MARTIN,
Acting President of the Senate.
 C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
 F. M. WYLLIE,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Mr. BURTON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Ohio, praying for the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the National Association of Automobile Manufacturers, favoring the adoption of an amendment to the so-called corporation-tax law permitting corporations to make returns at the end of their fiscal years, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of Greenwood Grange, No. 1061, of Hardin County; of Colebrook Grange, No. 1593; of Dunham Grange; of Leipsic Grange, No. 1664; of Warren Grange, No. 1715; of Parma Grange, No. 1732; of Pomona Grange, of Richland County; and of Pleasant Hill Grange, No. 598, of the Patrons of Husbandry, and of sundry citizens, all in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Ashtabula County, Ohio, praying for the establishment of a parcels-post system, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. SIMMONS presented a petition of the congregation of the Christian Church of Hyde County, N. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors into prohibition districts, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of sundry farmers of Santa Paula, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the inspection of foreign nursery stock, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BRADLEY presented a memorial of the Trade and Labor Assemblies of Kenton and Campbell Counties, in the State of Kentucky, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan certain tents for the use of the Astoria Centennial, to be held at Astoria, Oreg., August 10 to September 9, 1911, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 98) thereon.

Mr. CULBERSON, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (S. 955) to provide for the extension of the post-office and courthouse building at Dallas, Tex., and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 97) thereon.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT CHARLESTON, W. VA.

Mr. WATSON. From the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 2932) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, to sell the old post-office and courthouse building at Charleston, W. Va., and in the event of such sale to enter into a contract for the construction of a suitable post-office and courthouse building at Charleston, W. Va., without additional cost to the Government of the United States.

Mr. CHILTON. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill; and, there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.